Property of
FAMILY OF FAITH
LIBRARY

DATE DUE

THE

MIRACLES OF OUR LORD

Family of Faith Library

NOTES

ON

THE MIRACLES OF OUR LORD

BY

RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, D.D.

ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN

CHANCELLOR OF THE ORDER OF ST PATRICK

TWELFTH EDITION, REVISED

London

MACMILLAN AND CO.

1884

All rights reserved

LONDON: PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

CONTENTS.

PRELIMINARY ESSAY.

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	On the Names of the Miracles	1
II.	Miracles and Nature	9
III.	The Authority of Miracles	24
IV.	The Evangelical, compared with other Cycles of Miracles	37
V.	The Assaults on the Miracles	63
VI.	The Apologetic Worth of the Miracles	95

MIRACLES.

1.	The Changing of the Water into Wine	105
2.	The Healing of the Nobleman's Son	127
3.	The First Miraculous Draught of Fishes	135
4.	The Stilling of the Tempest	153
5.	The Demoniacs in the Country of the Gadarenes	162
6.	The Raising of Jairus' Daughter	193
7.	The Healing of the Woman with an Issue of Blood	204
8.	The Opening of the Eyes of Two Blind in the House	212
9.	The Healing of the Paralytic	216
10.	The Cleansing of the Leper	228
11.	The Healing of the Centurion's Servant	240
12.	The Demoniac in the Synagogue of Capernaum	248

PAGE

13. The Healing of Simon's Wife's Mother 252
14. The Raising of the Widow's Son 258
15. The Healing of the Impotent Man at Bethesda . . 264
16. The Miraculous Feeding of Five Thousand . . . 283
17. The Walking on the Sea 297
18. The Opening of the Eyes of one born Blind . . . 311
19. The Restoring of the Man with a Withered Hand . 337
20. The Restoring of the Woman with a Spirit of Infirmity 349
21. The Healing of the Man with a Dropsy . . . 355
22. The Cleansing of Ten Lepers 358
23. The Healing of the Daughter of the Syrophœnician Woman 367
24. The Healing of one Deaf and Dumb 378
25. The Miraculous Feeding of Four Thousand . . . 385
26. The Opening the Eyes of one Blind at Bethsaida . 389
27. The Healing of the Lunatic Child 393
28. The Finding of the Stater in the Fish's Mouth . 404
29. The Raising of Lazarus 420
30. The Opening of the Eyes of Two Blind Men near Jericho 466
31. The Cursing of the Barren Fig-tree 474
32. The Healing of Malchus' Ear 486
33. The Second Miraculous Draught of Fishes . . . 492

PRELIMINARY ESSAY.

CHAPTER I.

ON THE NAMES OF THE MIRACLES.

EVERY inquiry about a thing will best begin with an investigation of the name or names which it bears; for the name seizes and presents the most distinctive features, the innermost nature of the thing which we desire to understand, and embodies this in a word. In the name we have a witness to that which the universal sense of men, finding its utterance in language, has felt about the thing; and if we would know one, we must start with seeking to know also the other. It is true that in the investigation on which we are now entering, there is not one name only, but many, which present themselves for our study; for it results from what just has been said, that where we treat of a matter in many ways significant, its names also will be many, seeing that no one will exhaust all its meaning. Each will embody some essential qualities of the thing; and not from the contemplation exclusively of any one, but only of all of these together, will any adequate conception of that which we desire to understand be obtained. This will show itself abundantly true in the matter with which we have here to do. Thus what we usually term miracles, are in the sacred Scriptures termed sometimes 'wonders,' sometimes 'signs,' sometimes 'powers,' sometimes simply 'works.' Other titles also they bear, but of rarer occurrence; such as will easily range themselves under one or other of these.

On each of which it will be worth while to say something, before making any further advance in our study of the subject.

1. In the name '*wonder*,'[1] the astonishment which the work produces upon the beholders, an astonishment often graphically portrayed by the Evangelists when relating our Lord's miracles (Mark ii. 12; iv. 41; vi. 51; vii. 37; cf. Acts iii. 10, 11), is transferred to the work itself. This word, as will at once be felt, does but touch the outside of the matter. The ethical meaning of the miracle would be wholly lost, were blank astonishment or mere amazement *all* which it aroused; since the same effect might be produced by a thousand meaner causes. Indeed it is not a little remarkable, rather is it profoundly characteristic of the miracles of the New Testament, as Origen noted long ago,[2] that this name 'wonders' is never applied to them but in connexion with some other name. They are 'signs *and* wonders' (Acts xiv. 3; Rom. xv. 19; Matt. xxiv. 24; Heb. ii. 4); or 'signs' alone (John ii. 11; Acts viii. 6; Rev. xiii. 13); or 'powers' alone (Mark vi. 14; Acts xix. 11); but never 'wonders' alone.[3] Not that the

[1] Τέρας. The term θαῦμα, near akin to τέρας, and frequent in the Greek Fathers, never occurs in Scripture; θαυμάσιον only once (Matt. xxi. 15); but the θαυμάζειν is often brought out as a consequence (Matt. viii. 27; ix. 8, 33; xv. 31, &c.). Παράδοξον, which expresses the *unexpected* character of the wonder, its contradiction to previous expectation, and so the astonishment which it causes—a word frequent in ecclesiastical Greek—is found only at Luke v. 26; cf. Num. xvi. 30.

[2] *In Joh.* tom. xiii. § 6. Godet: Les miracles de Jésus ne sont pas de simples prodiges (τέρατα) destinés à frapper l'imagination. Il existe une relation étroite entre ces faits merveilleux et la personne de Celui qui les opère. Ce sont des emblèmes visibles de ce qu'il est, et de ce qu'il vient faire, des images rayonnantes du miracle permanent de la manifestation du Christ.

[2] We must regret that words, only subordinate in the Greek, should be chief with us—'wonder' I mean, and 'miracle'—to designate these divine facts, bringing out, as they do, only the accidental accompaniment, the *astonishment* which the work creates, and so little entering into the deeper meaning of the work itself. The Latin *miraculum* (not properly a substantive, but the neuter of miraculus) and the German *Wunder* lie under exactly the same defect.

miracle, considered simply as a wonder, as an astonishing event which the beholders can reduce to no law with which they are acquainted, is even as such without its meaning and its purpose; that purpose being forcibly to startle men from the dull dream of a sense-bound existence, and, however it may not be itself an appeal to the spiritual in man, yet to act as a summons to him that he now open his eyes to the spiritual appeal which is about to be addressed to him (Acts xiv. 8–18).

2. But the miracle is not a 'wonder' only; it is also a '*sign*,'[1] a token and indication of the near presence and working of God. In this word the ethical purpose of the miracle comes out the *most* prominently, as in 'wonder' the least. They are *signs* and pledges of something more than and beyond themselves (Isai. vii. 11; xxxviii. 7);[2]

[1] Σημεῖον might very well have been rendered 'sign' throughout; in the A. V. it is constantly so used; but in the Gospel of St. John, far oftener than not, 'sign' gives place to the vaguer 'miracle,' and this sometimes with manifest injury to the sense; thus see iii. 2; vii. 31; x. 41; and especially vi. 26. Our Version there makes Christ say to the multitude, who, once fed, gathered round Him again, 'Ye seek Me, not because ye saw *the miracles*,' &c. It should have been, 'Ye seek Me, not because ye saw *signs*' (σημεῖα without the article), 'not because ye recognized in those works of mine *tokens* and *intimations* of a higher presence; such as led you to conceive great thoughts of Me: no such glimpses of my higher nature bring you hither, coming as you do with no higher thought than that you may again be filled.

[2] Basil (*in loc.*): Ἔστι σημεῖον πρᾶγμα φανερὸν κεκρυμμένου τινὸς καὶ ἀφανοῦς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὴν δήλωσιν ἔχον: and presently after, ἡ μέντοι Γραφὴ τὰ παράδοξα, καὶ παραστατικά τινος μυστικοῦ λόγου σημεῖα καλεῖ. And Lampe well (*Comm. in Joh.* vol. i. p. 513): Designat sane σημεῖον naturâ suâ rem non tantum extraordinariam, sensusque percellentem, sed etiam talem, quæ in rei alterius, absentis licet et futuræ, *significationem* atque *adumbrationem* adhibetur, unde et prognostica (Matt. xvi. 3) et typi (Matt. xii. 39; Luc. xi. 29), nec non *sacramenta*, quale est illud circumcisionis (Rom. iv. 11), eodem nomine in Novo Testamento exprimi solent. Aptissime ergo hæc vox de miraculis usurpatur, ut indicet, quod non tantum admirabili modo fuerint perpetrata, sed etiam sapientissimo consilio Dei ita directa atque ordinata, ut fuerint simul *characteres* Messiæ, ex quibus cognoscendus erat, *sigilla* doctrinæ quam proferebat, et beneficiorum gratiæ per Messiam jam præstandæ, nec non *typi* viarum Dei earumque circumstantiarum per quas talia beneficia erant applicanda.

valuable, not so much for what they are, as for what they indicate of the grace and power of the doer, or of the connexion in which he stands with a higher world. Oftentimes they are thus seals of power set to the person who accomplishes them ('the Lord confirming the word by *signs* following,' Mark xvi. 20; Acts xiv. 3; Heb. ii. 4); legitimating acts, by which he claims to be accepted as a messenger from God.[1] 'What *sign* showest Thou?' (John ii. 18) was the question which the Jews asked, when they wanted the Lord to justify the things which He was doing, by showing that He had especial authority to do them. Again they say, 'We would see a *sign* from Thee' (Matt. xii. 38); 'Show us a *sign* from heaven' (Matt. xvi. 1). St. Paul speaks of himself as having 'the *signs* of an apostle' (2 Cor. xii. 12), in other words, the tokens which designate him as such. Thus, too, in the Old Testament, when God sends Moses to deliver Israel He furnishes him with two 'signs.' He warns him that Pharaoh will require him to legitimate his mission, to produce his credentials that he is indeed God's ambassador; and equips him with the powers which shall justify him as such, which, in other words, shall be his 'signs' (Exod. vii. 9, 10). He 'gave *a sign*' to the prophet, whom He sent to protest against the will-worship of Jeroboam (1 Kin. xiii. 3).[2]

[1] The Latin *monstrum*, whether we derive it with Cicero (*De Divin.* i. 42) from monstro, or with Festus from moneo (monstrum, velut monestrum, quod monet futurum; mahnendes portentum, Pott), though commonly used as = τέρας (Nec dubiis ea signa dedit Tritonia *monstris*, *Æn.* ii. 171; cf. vii. 81, 270), is in truth by either etymology more nearly related to σημεῖον. Thus Augustine, who follows Cicero's derivation (*De Civ. Dei*, xxi. 8): Monstra sane dicta perhibent a monstrando, quod aliquid significando demonstrant, et ostenta ab ostendendo, et portenta a portendendo, id est præostendendo, et prodigia quod porro dicant, id est futura prædicant. And *In Ev. Joh.* tract. xvi.: Prodigium appellatum est quasi *porrodicium*, quod porro dicat, porro significet, et aliquid futurum esse portendat. See Pauly, *Real-Encyclopädie*, vol. ii. p. 1139.

[2] Occasionally σημεῖον loses its special and higher signification, and is used simply as = τέρας. Herod hoped to have seen some 'sign' (σημεῖον) wrought by Christ (Luke xxiii. 8), but few things he would have desired

With all this it is well worth observing that the 'sign' is not of necessity a miracle, although only as such it has a place in our discussion. Many a common matter may be a 'sign' or seal set to the truth of some word, the announcement of which goes along with it; so that when that 'sign' comes true, it may be accepted as a pledge that the greater matter, which was, as it were, bound up with it, shall also come true in its time. Thus the Angels give to the shepherds for a 'sign' their finding of the Child wrapt in swaddling clothes in a manger (Luke ii. 12, cf. Exod. iii. 12).[1] Samuel gives to Saul three 'signs' that God has indeed appointed him king over Israel, and only the last of these is linked with aught supernatural (1 Sam. x. 1–9). The prophet gave Eli the death of his two sons as a 'sign' that his threatening word should come true (1 Sam. ii. 34, cf. Jer. xliv. 21, 30). God gave to Gideon a 'sign' in the camp of the Midianites of the victory which he should win (Judg. vii. 9–15), though the word does not happen there to occur[2] (cf. 2 Kin. vii. 2, 17–20).

less than a sign or indication of a present God; what he wanted was some glaring feat to set him agape—a *τέρας*—or, more properly yet, a *θαῦμα*, in the lowest sense of the word.

[1] Cf. Virgil, *Æn.* viii. 42–45, 81–83.

[2] The words *τέρας* and *σημεῖον* stand linked together, not merely in the N. T. (Acts ii. 22; iv. 30; 2 Cor. xii. 12; John iv. 48), but frequently in the Old (Exod. vii. 3, 9; xi. 9; Deut. iv. 34; vi. 22, and often; Neh. ix. 10; Isai. viii. 18; xx. 3; Dan. iv. 2; vi. 27; Ps. lxxviii. 43; civ. 27; cxxxiv. 9, LXX); and no less in profane Greek (Polybius, iii. 112, 8; Ælian, *V. H.* xii. 57; Josephus, *Antiqq.* xx. 8. 6; Philo, *De Vit. Mos.* i. 16; Plutarch, *Sept. Sap. Conv.* iii.). The distinction between them, as though the *τέρας* were the *more* wonderful, the *σημεῖον* the *less* so—as though it would be a *σημεῖον* to heal the sick, a *τέρας* to open the blind eyes, or to raise the dead (so Ammonius, *Cat. in Joh.* iv. 48: *τέρας ἐστὶ τὸ παρὰ φύσιν, οἷον τὸ ἀνοῖξαι ὀφθαλμοὺς τυφλῶν καὶ ἐγεῖραι νεκρόν· σημεῖον δὲ τὸ οὐκ ἔξω τῆς φύσεως, οἷόν ἐστιν ἰάσασθαι ἄῤῥωστον*), cannot stand, however frequent among some of the Greek Fathers (see Suicer, *Thes.* s. v. *σημεῖον*). Neither will Origen's distinction stand (*in Rom.* xv. 19): *Signa* appellantur, in quibus cum sit aliquid mirabile, indicatur quoque aliquid futurum. *Prodigia* vero in quibus tantummodo aliquid mirabile ostenditur. Rather the same miracle is upon one side a *τέρας*, on another a *σημεῖον*; and the words most often refer not to different classes of miracles, but to different aspects of the same miracles; so Fritzsche:

Or it is possible for a man, under a strong conviction that the hand of God is leading him, to set such or such a contingent event as a 'sign' to himself, the falling out of which in this way or in that he will accept as an intimation from God of what He would have him to do. Examples of this also are not uncommon in Scripture (Gen. xxiv. 14–21; Judg. vi. 36–40; 1 Sam. xiv. 8–13). Very curious, and standing by themselves, are the 'signs' which shall only come to pass *after* that of which they were the signs has actually befallen; but which shall still serve to confirm it as having been wrought directly of God (Exod. iii. 12; 2 Kin. xix. 29).

3. Frequently also the miracles are styled '*powers*' or '*mighty works*,' that is, of God.[1] As in the term 'wonder' or 'miracle,' the effect is transferred and gives a name to the cause, so here the cause gives its name to the effect.[2] The '*power*' dwells originally in the divine Messenger (Acts vi. 8; x. 38; Rom. xv. 19); is one with which he is himself equipped of God. Christ is thus in the highest sense that which Simon blasphemously suffered himself to be named, 'The great *Power of God*' (Acts viii. 10). But then, by an easy transition, the word comes to signify

Eandem rem diverse æstimatam exprimunt; and Lampe (*Comm. in Joh.* vol. i. p. 513): Eadem miracula dici possunt *signa*, quatenus aliquid seu occultum seu futurum docent; et *prodigia* (*τέρατα*), quatenus aliquid extraordinarium, quod stuporem excitat, sistunt. Hinc sequitur *signorum* notionem latius patere, quam *prodigiorum*. Omnia prodigia sunt *signa*, quia in illum usum a Deo dispensata, ut arcanum indicent. Sed omnia signa non sunt *prodigia*, quia ad signandum res cælestes aliquando etiam res communes adhibentur. Cf. 2 Chron. xxxii. 24, 31; where at ver. 24 that is called a *σημεῖον*, which at ver. 31 is a *τέρας* (LXX); and see my *Synonyms of the New Testament*, § 91.

[1] *Δυνάμεις* = virtutes.

[2] With this *ἐξουσία* is related, which yet only once occurs to designate a miracle. They are termed *ἔνδοξα* (Luke xiii. 17), as being works in which the *δόξα* of God came eminently out (see John ii. 11; xi. 40), and which in return caused men to *glorify* Him (Mark ii. 12). They are *μεγαλεῖα* (= magnalia, Luke i. 49), as outcomings of the *greatness* of God's power.

the exertions and separate puttings forth of this power. These are 'powers' in the plural, although the same word is now translated in our Version 'wonderful works' (Matt. vii. 22), and now, 'mighty works' (Matt. xi. 20; Mark vi. 14; Luke x. 13), and still more frequently, 'miracles' (Acts ii. 22; xix. 11; 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28; Gal. iii. 5); in this last case giving such tautologies as this, 'miracles *and* wonders' (Acts ii. 22; Heb. ii. 4); and obscuring for us the express purpose of the word, pointing as it does to new *powers* which have entered, and are working in, this world of ours.

These three terms, 'wonders,' 'signs,' and 'powers,' occur three times in connexion with one another (Acts ii. 22; 2 Cor. xii. 12; 2 Thess. ii. 9), although on each occasion in a different order. They are all, as has already been noted in the case of two, rather descriptive of different aspects of the same works, than themselves different classes of works.[1] An example of one of our Lord's miracles will illustrate what I say. The healing of the paralytic (Mark ii. 1–12) was a *wonder*, for they who beheld it 'were all *amazed*;' it was a *power*, for the man at Christ's word 'arose, took up his bed, and went out before them all;' it was a *sign*, for it gave token that One greater than men deemed was among them; it stood in connexion with a higher fact of which it was the seal and sign (cf. 1 Kin. xiii. 3; 2 Kin. i. 10), being wrought that they might 'know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins.'[2]

[1] Pelt's definition (*Comm. in Thess.* p. 179) is brief and good: Parum differunt tria ista δυνάμεις, σημεῖα, τέρατα. Δύναμις numero singulari tamen est vis miraculorum edendorum; σημεῖα quatenus comprobandæ inserviunt doctrinæ sive missioni divinæ; τέρατα portenta sunt, quæ admirationem et stuporem excitant. Cf. Calvin on 2 Cor. xii. 12: Signa porro vocantur, quod non sunt inania spectacula, sed quæ destinata sunt docendis hominibus. Prodigia, quod suâ novitate expergefacere homines debent, et percellere. Potentiæ aut virtutes, quod sunt magis insignia specimina divinæ potentiæ, quam quæ cernimus in ordinario naturæ cursu.

[2] Of the verbs connected with these nouns we may observe in the

4. Eminently significant is another term by which St. John very frequently names the miracles. They are constantly for him simply '*works*'[1] (v. 36; vii. 21; x. 25, 32, 38; xiv. 11, 12; xv. 24; cf. Matt. xi. 2); as though the wonderful were only the natural form of working for Him who is dwelt in by all the fulness of God; He must, out of the necessity of his higher being, put forth these works greater than man's. They are the periphery of that circle whereof He is the centre. The great miracle is the Incarnation; all else, so to speak, follows naturally and of course. It is no wonder that He whose name is 'Wonderful' (Isai. ix. 6) does works of wonder; the only wonder would be if He did them not.[2] The sun in the heavens is itself a wonder; but it is not a wonder that, being what it is, it rays forth its effluences of light and heat. These miracles are the fruit after its kind which the divine tree brings forth; and may, with a deep truth, be styled the 'works'[3] of Christ, with no further addition or explanation.

first three Evangelists, *σημεῖα διδόναι* (Matt. xii. 39; xxiv. 24; Mark viii. 12), and still more frequently *δυνάμεις ποιεῖν* (Matt. vii. 22; xiii. 58; Mark ix. 39, &c.). Neither phrase occurs in St. John, but *σημεῖα ποιεῖν* continually (ii. 11; iii. 2; iv. 54; &c.), which is altogether wanting in the earlier Evangelists; but occurs in Acts (vii. 36; xv. 12) and in the book of Revelation (xiii. 13; xix. 20). Once St. John has *σημεῖα δεικνύειν* (ii. 18).

[1] The miracles of the Old Testament are called *ἔργα*, Heb. iii. 9; Ps. xciv. 9, LXX.

[2] Augustine (*In Ev. Joh. tract.* xvii.): Mirum non esse debet a Deo factum miraculum. . . . Magis gaudere et admirari debemus quia Dominus noster et Salvator Jesus Christus homo factus est, quam quod divina inter homines Deus fecit.

[3] This interpretation of *ἔργα*, as used by St. John, has sometimes been called in question, and by this word has been understood the sum total of his acts and his teachings, his words and his works, as they came under the eyes of men; not excluding the miracles, but including much else. The only passage urged in proof with any apparent force (John xvii. 4) is beside the question; for that *ἔργον in the singular* may, and here does, signify his whole work and task, is beyond all doubt; but that his *ἔργα* are his miracles, the following passages, v. 36; x. 25, 32, 38; xiv. 11; xv. 24; to which others might be added, decisively prove.

CHAPTER II.

MIRACLES AND NATURE.

WHEREIN, it may be asked, does the miracle differ from any event in the ordinary course of nature? For that too is wonderful; the fact that it is a marvel of continual recurrence may rob it, subjectively, of our admiration; we may be content to look at it with a dull incurious eye, and to think we find an explanation of it in its constant repetition, even as we often find in this repetition sufficient reason for excusing ourselves altogether from wonder and reverent admiration;[1] yet it does not remain the less a marvel still.

To this question some have answered, that since all is thus marvellous, since the grass growing, the seed sprouting, the sun rising, are as much the result of powers

[1] See Augustine, *De Gen. ad Lit.* xii. 18; *De Civ. Dei*, xxi. 8, 3; and Gregory the Great (*Hom.* xxvi. *in Evang.*): Quotidiana Dei miracula ex assiduitate viluerunt. Cf. Cicero, *De Nat. Deor.* ii. 38; and Lucretius, ii. 1027–1038:—

> Nil adeo magnum, neque tam mirabile quicquam
> Quod non paulatim mittant mirarier omnes.
> Percipito cæli clarum purumque colorem,
> Quæque in se cohibet, palantia sidera passim,
> Lunamque et solis præclarâ luce nitorem:
> Omnia quæ nunc si primum mortalibus extent,
> Ex improviso si sint objecta repente,
> Quid magis his rebus poterat mirabile dici,
> Aut minus ante quod auderent fore credere gentes?
> Nil, ut opinor; ita hæc species miranda fuisset;
> Quum tibi jam nemo, fessus satiate videndi,
> Suspicere in cæli dignatur lucida templa.

which we cannot trace or measure, as the water turned into wine, or the sick healed by a word, or the blind restored to vision by a touch, there is therefore no such thing as a miracle, eminently so called. We have no right, they say, in the mighty and complex miracle of nature which encompasses us on every side, to separate off in an arbitrary manner some certain facts, and to affirm of this and the other that they are wonders, and all the rest ordinary processes of nature; but rather we must confine ourselves to one language or the other, and count all miracle, or nothing.

But this, however at first sight it may seem very deep and true, is indeed most shallow and fallacious. There is quite enough in itself and in its purposes to distinguish that which we call by this name, from all with which it is thus sought to be confounded, and in which to be lost. The distinction indeed which is sometimes drawn, that in the miracle God is immediately working, and in other events is leaving it to the laws which He has established to work, cannot at all be allowed: for it rests on a dead mechanical view of the universe, altogether remote from the truth. The clock-maker makes his clock, and leaves it; the ship-builder builds and launches his ship, which others navigate; but the world is no curious piece of mechanism which its Maker constructs, and then dismisses from his hands, only from time to time reviewing and repairing it, but, as our Lord says, 'My Father worketh hitherto, and I work' (John v. 17); He 'upholdeth all things by the word of his power'[1] (Heb. i. 3). And to speak of 'laws

[1] Augustine: Sunt qui arbitrantur tantummodo mundum ipsum factum a Deo; cetera jam fieri ab ipso mundo, sicut ille ordinavit et jussit, Deum autem ipsum nihil operari. Contra quos profertur illa sententia Domini, Pater meus usque adhuc operatur, et ego operor. . . . Neque enim, sicut a structurâ ædium, cum fabricaverit quis, abscedit; atque illo cessante et absente stat opus ejus; ita mundus vel ictu oculi stare poterit, si ei Deus regimen suum subtraxerit. So Melanchthon (*In loc. de Creatione*): Infirmitas humana etiamsi cogitat Deum esse conditorem, tamen postea imaginatur, ut faber discedit a navi exstructâ et relinquit

of God,' 'laws of nature,' may become to us a language altogether deceptive, and hiding the deeper reality from our eyes. *Laws* of God exist only for us. It is a *will* of God for Himself.[1] That will indeed, being the will of highest wisdom and love, excludes all *wilfulness*; it is a will upon which we can securely count; from the past expressions of it we can presume its future, and so we rightfully call it a law. But still from moment to moment it is a will; each law, as we term it, of nature is only that which we have learned concerning this will in that particular region of its activity. To say then that there is more of the will of God in a miracle than in any other work of his, is insufficient.

Yet while we deny the conclusion, that since all is wonder, therefore the miracle, commonly so called, is only in the same way as the ordinary processes of nature a manifestation of the presence and power of God, we must not with this deny the truth which lies in this statement. All *is* wonder; to make a man is at least as great a marvel as to raise a man from the dead. The seed that multiplies in the furrow is as marvellous as the bread that multiplied in Christ's hands. The miracle is not a *greater* manifestation of God's power than those ordinary and ever-repeated processes; but it is a *different* manifestation.[2] By those other God is speaking at all times and to

eam nautis; ita Deum discedere a suo opere, et relinqui creaturas tantum propriæ gubernationi; hæc imaginatio magnam caliginem offundit animis et parit dubitationes. On the conservatio divina there is much of interest in Rothe, *Dogmatik*, vol. i. p. 162 sqq. Goethe has well asked,

> Was wär' ein Gott, der nur von Aussen stiesse,
> Im Kreis das All' am Finger laufen liesse?
> Ihm ziemt's, die Welt im Innern zu bewegen,
> Natur in sich, sich in Natur zu hegen,
> So dass, was in ihm lebt und webt und ist,
> Nie seine Kraft, nie seinen Geist vermisst.

[1] Augustine (*De Civ. Dei*, xxi. 8): Dei voluntas natura rerum est.

[2] Augustine (*Serm.* ccxlii. 1): In homine carnali tota regula intelligendi est consuetudo cernendi. Quod solent videre credunt: quod non

all the world; they are a vast unbroken revelation of Him. 'The invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead' (Rom. i. 20). Yet from the very circumstance that nature is thus speaking evermore to all, that this speaking is diffused over all time, addressed unto all men, that its sound has gone out into all lands, from the very constancy and universality of this language, it may fail to make itself heard. It cannot be said to stand in nearer relation to one man than to another, to confirm one man's word more than that of others, to address one man's conscience more than that of every other man. However it may sometimes have, it must often lack, a peculiar and personal significance. But in the miracle, wrought in the sight of some certain men, and claiming their special attention, there is a speaking to them in particular. There is then a voice in nature which addresses itself directly to them, a singling of them out from the multitude. It is plain that God has now a peculiar word which they are to give heed to, a message to which He is bidding them to listen.[1]

solent, non credunt. . . . Majora quidem miracula sunt, tot quotidie homines nasci qui non erant, quam paucos resurrexisse qui erant: et tamen ista miracula non considerationc comprehensa sunt, sed assiduitate viluerunt. Cf. Gregory the Great, *Moral.* vi. 15.

[1] All this is brought out in a very instructive discussion on the miracle, which finds place in Augustine's great dogmatic work, *De Trinit.* iii. 5, and extends to the chapters upon either side, being the largest statement of his views upon the subject which anywhere finds place in his works: Quis attrahit humorem per radicem vitis ad botrum et vinum facit, nisi Deus, qui et homine plantante et rigante incrementum dat? Sed cum ad nutum Domini aqua in vinum inusitatâ celeritate conversa est, etiam stultis fatentibus, vis divina declarata est. Quis arbusta fronde et flore vestit solemniter, nisi Deus? Verum cum floruit virga sacerdotis Aaron, collocuta est quodam modo cum dubitante humanitate divinitas. . . . Cum fiunt illa continuato quasi quodam fluvio labentium manantiumque rerum, et ex occulto in promptum, atque ex prompto in occultum, usitato itinere transeuntium, naturalia dicuntur: cum vero admonendis hominibus inusitatâ mutabilitate ingeruntur, magnalia nominantur.

An extraordinary divine causality, and not that ordinary which we acknowledge everywhere and in everything, belongs, then, to the essence of the miracle; powers of God other than those which have always been working; such, indeed, as most seldom or never have been working before. The unresting activity of God, which at other times hides and conceals itself behind the veil of what we term natural laws, does in the miracle unveil itself; it steps out from its concealment, and the hand which works is laid bare. Beside and beyond[1] the ordinary operations of nature, higher powers (higher, not as coming from a higher source, but as working toward higher ends) intrude and make themselves felt even at the very springs and sources of her power.

While it is of the very essence of the miracle that it should be thus 'a new thing,' it is not herewith denied that the natural itself may become miraculous *to us* by the way in which it is timed, by the ends which it is made to serve. It is indeed true that aught which is perfectly explicable from the course of nature and history is assuredly no miracle in the most proper sense of the word. At the same time the finger of God may be so plainly discernible in it, there may be in it so remarkable a convergence of many unconnected causes to a single end, it may so meet a crisis in the lives of men, or in the onward march of the kingdom of God, may stand in such noticeable relation with God's great work of redemption, that even while it is plainly explicable by natural causes, while there are such, perfectly adequate to produce the effects, we yet may be entirely justified in terming it a miracle, a *providential*, although not an absolute, miracle. Absolute it cannot be called, since there were known causes

[1] Not, as we shall see the greatest theologians have always earnestly contended, *contra* naturam, but *præter* naturam and *supra* naturam. 'A miracle,' says Mill (*Logic*, vol. ii. p. 187), 'is no contradiction to the law of cause and effect. It is a new effect, supposed to be introduced by the introduction of a new cause.'

perfectly capable of bringing it about, and, these existing, it would be superstition to betake ourselves to others, or to seek to disconnect it from these. Yet the natural may in a manner lift itself up into the miraculous, by the moment at which it falls out, by the purposes which it is made to fulfil. It is a subjective wonder, a wonder *for us*, though not an objective, not a wonder in itself.

Thus many of the plagues of Egypt were the natural plagues of the land,[1]—these, it is true, raised and quickened into far direr than their usual activity. In itself it was nothing miraculous that grievous swarms of flies should infest the houses of the Egyptians, or that flights of locusts should devour their fields, or that a murrain should destroy their cattle. None of these visitations were, or are, unknown in that land; but the intensity of *all* these plagues, the dread succession in which they followed on one another, their connexion with the word of Moses which went before, with Pharaoh's trial which was proceeding, with Israel's deliverance which they helped onward, the order of their coming and going, all these entirely justify us in calling them 'the signs and wonders of Egypt,' even as such is evermore the scriptural language about them (Deut. iv. 34; Ps. lxxviii. 43; Acts vii. 36). In the same manner it is no absolute miracle that a coin should be found in a fish's mouth (Matt. xvii. 27), or that a lion should meet a man and slay him (1 Kin. xiii. 24), or that a thunderstorm should happen at an unusual period of the year (1 Sam. xii. 16–19); and yet these circumstances may be so timed for strengthening faith, for punishing disobedience, for awakening repentance, they may serve such high purposes in God's moral government, that we at once range them in the catalogue of miracles, without seeking to make an anxious discrimination between the miracle absolute and providential.[2] Especially have they a right to

[1] See Hengstenberg, *Die Bücher Mosis und Aegypten*, pp. 93–129.

[2] The attempt to exhaust the history of our Lord's life of miracle

their place among these, when (as in each of the instances alluded to above) the final event is a sealing of a foregoing word from the Lord; for so, as prophecy, as miracles of his *foreknowledge*, they claim that place, even if not as miracles of his *power*. It is true, of course, of these even more than of any other, that they exist only for the religious mind, for the man who believes that God rules, and not merely in power, but in wisdom, in righteousness, and in love; for him they will be eminently *signs*, signs of a present working God. In the case of the more absolute miracle it will be sometimes possible to extort from the ungodly, as of old from the magicians of Egypt, the unwilling confession, 'This is the finger of God' (Exod. viii. 19); but this in the case of these will be well nigh impossible; since there is always the natural solution in which they may take refuge, beyond which they will refuse, and beyond which it will be impossible to compel them, to proceed.

But while the miracle is not thus nature, so neither is it *against* nature. That language, however common, is wholly inadmissible, which speaks of these wonderful works of God as *violations* of a natural law.[1] *Beyond* nature, *beyond* and *above* the nature which we know, they are, but not contrary to it.[2] Nor let it be said that this distinction

by the assumption of wonderful fortuitous coincidences might pass once or twice without challenge: but that such happy chances should on every occasion recur, what is this for one who knows even but a little of the theory of probabilities? not the delivering the history of its marvellous element, but the exchanging of one set of marvels for another. If it be urged that this was not mere hazard, what manner of person then *must* we conclude Him to be, whom nature was always thus at such pains to serve and to seal?

[1] Alia, says Hugh of St. Victor, ex ratione; alia secundum rationem; alia supra rationem; alia contra rationem; these severally being, necessaria, probabilia, mirabilia, incredibilia.

[2] It is impossible to accept the assistance which Perrone, the most influential dogmatic writer in the modern Roman Catholic Church, offers us here. He, in a nominalism pushed to a most extravagant excess, denies that the miracle is or can be either against or above the laws of nature, seeing that in fact there are no such laws for it to violate or to

is an idle one; so far from being idle, Spinoza's whole assault upon the miracles (not his real objections, for they lie much deeper, but his assault [1]) turns, as we shall see, upon the advantage which he has known how to take of this faulty statement of the truth; and, when that has been rightly stated, becomes at once beside the mark. The miracle is not thus *unnatural*; nor could it be such; since the unnatural, the contrary to order, is of itself the ungodly, and can in no way therefore be affirmed of a divine work, such as that with which we have to do. The very idea of the world, as more than one name which it bears testifies, is that of *an order*; that, therefore, which comes in to enable it to realize this idea which it has lost, will scarcely itself be a disorder. So far from this, the true miracle is a higher and a purer nature, coming down out of the world of untroubled harmonies into this world of ours, which so many discords have jarred and disturbed, and bringing this back again, though it be but for one mysterious prophetic moment, into harmony with that higher.[2] The healing of the sick can in no way be termed

transcend, no working of God in the external world according to any fixed and established rules (*Prælect. Theol.* vol. i. p. 47): Deus non regit genera vel species, quæ non sunt nisi ideæ abstractæ, sed regit individua, quæ sola realia sunt, neque regit legibus universalibus, quæ pariter non sunt nisi in conceptu nostro, sed regit voluntate peculiari, individua, singula. Extremes meet: he too, denying any law, has made the miracle as impossible as those who affirm the law to be absolutely immutable.

[1] *Tract. Theol. Pol.* vi. *De Miraculis.*

[2] Augustine (*Con. Faust.* lvi. 3): Contra naturam non incongrue dicimus aliquid Deum facere, quod facit contra id quod novimus in naturâ. Hanc enim etiam appellamus naturam, cognitum nobis cursum solitumque naturæ, contra quem cum Deus aliquid facit, magnalia vel mirabilia nominantur. Contra illam vero summam naturæ legem a notitiâ remotam sive impiorum sive adhuc infirmorum, tam Deus nullo modo facit quam contra seipsum non facit. Cf. xxvi. 3: Deus creator et conditor omnium naturarum nihil contra naturam facit, quia id est naturale cuique rei quod facit a quo est omnis modus, numerus, et ordo naturæ. Cf. xxix. 2; and *De Civ. Dei*, xxi. 8. The speculations of the great thinkers of the thirteenth century, on the subject of miracles, and especially on this side of the subject, are well brought together by Neander (*Kirch. Gesch.* vol. v. pp. 910–925).

against nature, seeing that the sickness which was healed was against the true nature of man, that it is sickness which is abnormal, and not health. The healing is the restoration of the primitive order. We should see in the miracle not the infraction of a law, but the neutralizing of a lower law, the suspension of it for a time by a higher.[1] Of this abundant analogous examples are evermore going forward before our eyes. Continually we behold in the world around us lower laws held in suspense by higher, mechanic by dynamic, chemical by vital, physical by moral; yet we do not say, when the lower thus gives place in favour of the higher, that there was any violation of law, or that anything contrary to nature came to pass; rather we acknowledge the law of a greater freedom swallowing up the law of a lesser.

When Spinoza affirmed that nothing can happen in nature which *opposes* its universal laws, he acutely saw that even then he had not excluded the miracle, and therefore, to clench the exclusion, added—'or which does not follow from the same laws.' But all which experience can teach us is, that these powers which are working in our world will not reach to these effects. Whence dare we to conclude, that because none which we know will bring them about, so none exist which will do so? They exceed the laws of *our* nature, but it does not therefore follow that they exceed the laws of *all* nature. If the animals were capable of a reflective act, man would appear a miracle to them, as the Angels do to us, and as the animals would themselves appear to a lower circle of

[1] Godet has on this matter said in language of a rare beauty: Si l'œuvre de la nature était la pensée définitive du Créateur, il est certain que le miracle serait souverainement improbable. Car un fait de ce genre ressemblerait à une retouche, et ce procédé serait indigne d'un tel artiste. Mais si la nature actuelle est une ébauche, d'où doit se dégager, avec le concours de la créature libre, une œuvre supérieure, dans laquelle la matière sera purement l'organe et la splendeur de l'esprit, le miracle est, aux yeux du penseur, l'apparition anticipée et le prélude ravissant de ce nouvel ordre de choses. Ce n'est point un solde; c'est une arrhe.

organized life. The comet is a miracle as regards our solar system; that is, it does not own the laws of our system, neither do those laws explain it. Yet is there a higher and wider law of the heavens, whether fully discovered or not, in which its motions are included as surely as those of the planets which stand in immediate relation to our sun. When I lift my arm, the law of gravitation is not, as far as my arm is concerned, denied or annihilated; it exists as much as ever, but is held in suspense by the higher law of my will. The chemical laws which would bring about decay in animal substances still subsist, even when they are restrained and hindered by the salt which keeps those substances from corruption. The law of sin in a regenerate man is held in continual check by the law of the spirit of life; yet is it in his members still, not indeed working, for a mightier law has stepped in and now holds it in abeyance, but still there, and ready to work, did that higher law cease from its more effectual operation. What in each of these cases is wrought may be against one particular law, that law being contemplated in its isolation, and rent away from the complex of laws, whereof it forms only a part. But no law does stand thus alone, and it is not against, but rather in entire harmony with, the system of laws; for the law of those laws is, that where powers come into conflict, the weaker shall give place to the stronger, the lower to the higher.[1] In the miracle, this world of ours is drawn into and within a higher order of things; laws are then working in it, which are not the laws of its fallen condition, but laws of

[1] In remarkable words the author of the *Wisdom of Solomon* (xix. 6) describes how at the passage of the Red Sea all nature was in its kind moulded and fashioned anew (ἡ κτίσις πάλιν ἄνωθεν διετυποῦτο), that it might serve God's purposes for the deliverance of his people, and punishment of his enemies (cf. xi. 16, 17); and Sedulius (*Carm. Pasch.* i. 85):

Subditur omnis
Imperiis natura tuis; rituque soluto
Transit in adversas jussu dominante figuras.

mightier range and higher perfection; and as such they claim to make themselves felt; they assert the preëminence and predominance which are rightly their own.[1] A familiar illustration borrowed from our own church-system of feasts and fasts may make this clearer. It is the rule here, that if the festival of the Nativity fall on a day which was designated in the ordinary calendar for a fast, the festival shall displace the fast, and the day shall be festally observed. Shall we therefore say that the Church has awkwardly contrived two systems which at this point may, and sometimes do, come into collision with one another? and not rather admire her more complex law, and note how in the very concurrence of the two, with the displacement of the poorer by the richer, she brings out her sense

[1] Martensen (*Christ. Dogmatik*, § 17): Der Einheitspunkt des Natürlichen und Uebernatürlichen liegt in der teleologischen Bestimmung der Natur für das Reich Gottes, und in der damit gegebenen Empfänglichkeit und Bildungsfahigkeit der Natur für die übernatürliche Schöpferthätigkeit. The whole passage is admirable, but too long to quote. On the manner in which God in the old creation did not exclude the possibilities of the new, but rather left room for them, Augustine has anticipated, as so often, much of the speculation of the later world. Thus *De Gen. ad Lit.* x. 17: Elementa mundi hujus corporei habent definitam vim qualitatemque suam, quid unumquodque valeat vel non valeat, quid de quo fieri possit vel non possit. Super hunc autem motum cursumque rerum naturalem, potestas Creatoris habet apud se posse de his omnibus facere aliud quam eorum quasi seminales rationes habent, non tamen id quod non in eis posuit, ut de his fieri vel ab ipso possit. Neque enim potentiâ temerariâ sed sapientiæ virtute omnipotens est; et hoc de unâquâque re in tempore suo facit, quod ante in eâ fecit ut possit. Alius ergo est rerum modus, quo illa herba sic germinat, illa sic; illa ætas parit, illa non parit; homo loqui potest, pecus non potest. Horum et talium modorum rationes non tantum in Deo sunt, sed ab illo etiam rebus creatis inditæ atque concreatæ. Ut autem lignum de terrâ excisum, aridum, perpolitum, sine radice ullâ, sine terrâ et aquâ repente floreat et fructum gignat, ut per juventam sterilis fœmina in senectâ pariat, ut asina loquatur, et si quid ejusmodi est, dedit quidem naturis quas creavit ut ex eis et hæc fieri possent, (neque enim ex eis vel ille faceret quod ex eis fieri non posse ipse præfigeret, quoniam se ipso non est nec ipse potentior,) verumtamen alio modo dedit, ut non hæc haberent in motu naturali, sed in eo quo ita creata essent, ut eorum natura voluntati potentiori amplius subjaceret. Compare vi. 23: Potentiâ quippe suâ numeros creaturæ dedit, non ipsam potentiam eisdem numeris alligavit.

that holy joy is a loftier thing even than holy sorrow, and shall at last swallow it up altogether?[1]

It is with these wonders which have been, exactly as it will be with those wonders which we look for in regard of our own mortal bodies, and this physical universe. We do not speak of the changes in store for these, as violations of law. We should not speak of the resurrection of the body as something contrary to nature; as unnatural; yet no power now working upon our bodies could bring it about; it must be wrought by some power not yet displayed, which God has kept in reserve. So, too, the mighty transformation which is in store for the outward world, out of which it shall come forth a new heaven and a new earth, 'the regeneration' of Matt. xix. 28, far exceeds any energies now working in the world, to bring it to pass (however there may be predispositions for it now, starting points from which it will proceed); yet it so belongs to the true idea of the world, now so imperfectly realized, that when it does take place, it will be felt to be the truest nature, which only then at length shall have

[1] Thus Aquinas, whose greatness and depth upon the subject of miracles I well remember hearing Coleridge exalt, and painfully contrast with the modern theology on the same subject (*Sum. Theol.* pars i. qu. 105, art. 6): A quâlibet causâ derivatur aliquis ordo in suos effectus, cum quælibet causa habeat rationem principii. Et ideo secundum multiplicationem causarum multiplicantur et ordines, quorum unus continetur sub altero, sicut et causa continetur sub causâ. Unde causa superior non continetur sub ordine causæ inferioris, sed e converso. Cujus exemplum apparet in rebus humanis. Nam ex patrefamiliâs dependet ordo domûs, qui continetur sub ordine civitatis, qui procedit a civitatis rectore: cum et hic contineatur sub ordine regis, a quo totum regnum ordinatur. Si ergo ordo rerum consideretur prout dependet a primâ causâ, sic contra rerum ordinem Deus facere non potest. Si enim sic faceret, faceret *contra* suam præscientiam aut voluntatem aut bonitatem. Si vero consideretur rerum ordo, prout dependet a quâlibet secundarum causarum, sic Deus potest facere *præter* ordinem rerum; quia ordini secundarum causarum ipse non est subjectus; sed talis ordo ei subjicitur, quasi ab eo procedens, non per necessitatem naturæ, sed per arbitrium voluntatis; potuisset enim et alium ordinem rerum instituere. And after a long discussion in his work *Con. Gentiles*, he thus defines the miracles (ii. 102): Illa igitur proprie miracula dicenda sunt, quæ divinitus fiunt præter ordinem communiter observatum in rebus.

come perfectly to the birth. The miracles of earth, as Jean Paul has said, are the laws of heaven.

The miracles, then, not being against nature, however they may be beside and beyond it, are in no respect slights cast upon its ordinary and every-day workings; but rather, when contemplated aright, are an honouring of them, in the witness which they render to the source from which these also originally proceed. For Christ, healing a sick man by his word, is claiming herein to be the lord and author of all healing powers which have ever exerted their beneficent influence on the bodies of men, and saying, 'I will prove this fact, which you are ever losing sight of or denying, that in Me the fontal power which goes forth in a thousand gradual cures resides, by only speaking at this time a word, and bringing back a man unto perfect health;'—not thus cutting off those other and more gradual healings from his person, but truly linking them to it.[1] So again when He multiplies the bread, when He changes the water into wine, what does He here but say, 'It is I and no other who, by the sunshine and the shower, by the seed-time and the harvest, give food for the use of man; and you shall learn this, which you are evermore unthankfully forgetting, by witnessing for once or for twice, or, if not actually witnessing, yet having it rehearsed in your ears for ever, how the essences of things are mine, how the bread grows in my hands, how the water, not drawn up into the vine, nor slowly transmuted into the juices of the grape, nor from thence expressed in the vat, but simply at my bidding, changes into wine. The children of this world "sacrifice unto their net, and

[1] Bernard Connor's *Evangelium Medici, seu Medicina Mystica*, London, 1697, awakened some attention at the time of publication, and drew down many suspicions of infidelity on its author (see the *Biographie Universelle* under his name). On a slight acquaintance, my impression is that these charges are without any ground. The book bears on this present part of our subject; and some account of it is given in a very interesting article by Diestel, *Bibel- und Naturkunde*, in the *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1866, p. 493, sqq.

burn incense to their drag," but it is I who, giving you in a moment the draught of fishes which you had yourselves long laboured for in vain, will remind you *who* guides them through the ocean paths, and suffers you either to toil long and to take nothing, or crowns your labours with a rich and unexpected harvest of the sea.'—Even the single miracle which wears an aspect of severity, that of the withered fig-tree, speaks the same language, for in that the same gracious Lord is declaring, 'These scourges of mine, wherewith I punish your sins, and summon you to repentance, continually miss their purpose altogether, or need to be repeated again and again; and this mainly because you see in them only the evil accidents of a blind nature; but I will show you that it is I and no other who smite the earth with a curse, who both can and do send these strokes for the punishing of the sins of men.'

And we can quite perceive how all this should have been necessary.[1] For if in one sense the orderly workings of nature reveal the glory of God (Ps. xix. 1–6), in another they may hide that glory from our eyes; if they ought to make us continually to remember Him, yet there is danger that they lead us to forget Him, until this world around us shall prove—not a translucent medium, through which we behold Him, but a thick impenetrable curtain, concealing Him wholly from our sight. 'There is in every miracle,' says Donne, 'a silent chiding of the world, and a tacit reprehension of them who require, or who need, miracles.' Did they serve no other purpose than this, namely to testify the liberty of God, and to affirm his will, which, however it habitually shows itself *in* nature, is yet more than and above nature, were it only to break a link

[1] Augustine (*Enarr. in Ps.* cx. 4): [Deus] reservans opportune inusitata prodigia, quæ infirmitas hominis novitati intenta meminerit, cum sint ejus miracula quotidiana majora. Tot per universam terram arbores creat, et nemo miratur; arefecit verbo unam, et stupefacta sunt corda mortalium. . . . Hoc enim miraculum maxime adtentis cordibus inhærebit, quod assiduitas non vilefecerit.

in that chain of cause and effect, which else we should come to regard as itself God, as the iron chain of an inexorable necessity, binding heaven no less than earth, they would serve a great purpose, they would not have been wrought in vain. But there are other purposes than these, and purposes yet more nearly bearing on the salvation of men, to which they serve, and to the consideration of these we have now arrived.[1]

[1] J. Müller (*De Mirac. J. C. Nat. et Necess.* par. i. p. 43): Etiamsi nullus alius miraculorum esset usus, nisi ut absolutam illam divinæ voluntatis libertatem demonstrent, humanamque arrogantiam, immodicæ legis naturalis admirationi junctam, compescant, miracula haud temere essent edita.

CHAPTER III.

THE AUTHORITY OF MIRACLES.

IS the miracle to command absolutely, and without further question, the obedience of those in whose sight it is done, or to whom it comes as an adequately attested fact, so that the doer and the doctrine, without further debate, shall be accepted as from God? It cannot be so, for side by side with the miracles which serve for the furthering of the kingdom of God, runs another line of wonders, the counterworkings of him, who is ever the ape of the Most High; who has still his caricatures of the holiest; and who knows that in no way can he so realize his character of Satan or 'the Hinderer,' as by offering that which shall either be accepted instead of the true, or, being discovered to be false, shall bring the true into like discredit with itself. For that Scripture attributes *real* wonders to him, though miracles wrought in a sphere rigidly defined and shut in by the power of God, there seems to me no manner of doubt. His wonders are 'lying' (2 Thess. ii. 9), not because in themselves mere illusions and jugglery, but because they are wrought to sustain the kingdom of lies.[1] The Egyptian magicians, his servants,

[1] Gerhard (*Loc. Theoll.* loc. xxiii. 11, 274): Antichristi miracula dicuntur mendacia, . . . non tam ratione *formæ*, quasi omnia futura sint falsa et adparentia duntaxat, quam ratione *finis*, quia scilicet ad confirmationem mendacii erunt directa. Chrysostom, who explains the passage in the other way, that they are 'lying' quoad formam (*οὐδὲν ἀληθές, ἀλλὰ πρὸς ἀπάτην τὰ πάντα*), yet suggests the correcter explanation,

stood in relation to a spiritual kingdom, as truly as did Moses and Aaron. Only when we recognize this, does the conflict between those and these come out in its true significance. It loses this nearly or altogether, if we contemplate their wonders as mere conjurors' tricks, dexterous sleights of hand, with which they imposed upon Pharaoh and his servants; making believe, and no more, that their rods also changed into serpents (Exod. vii. 11, 12), that they also changed water into blood (Exod. vii. 22). Rather was this a conflict not merely between the might of Egypt's king and the power of God; but *the gods* of Egypt, the spiritual powers of wickedness which underlay, and were the informing soul of, that dark and evil kingdom, were in conflict with the God of Israel. In this conflict, it is true, their nothingness very soon was apparent; their resources quickly came to an end; but yet most truly the two unseen kingdoms of light and darkness did then in presence of Pharaoh do open battle, each seeking to win the king for itself, and to draw him into its own element.[1]

ἢ διεψευσμένοις, ἢ εἰς ψεῦδος ἄγουσι. Augustine (*De Civ. Dei*, xx. 19) does not absolutely determine for either: Solet ambigi, utrum propterea dicta sint signa et prodigia mendacii, quoniam mortales sensus per phantasmata decepturus sit [Antichristus]; ut quod non faciat, facere videatur; an quia illa ipsa, etiamsi erunt vera prodigia, ad mendacium pertrahent credituros non ea potuisse, nisi divinitus fieri, virtutem diaboli nescientes. According to Aquinas they will only be *relative* wonders (*Summ. Theol.* p. I[a], qu. 114. art. 4): Dæmones possunt facere miracula, quæ scilicet homines mirantur, in quantum eorum facultatem et cognitionem excedunt. Nam et unus homo in quantum facit aliquid quod est supra facultatem et cognitionem alterius, ducit alium in admirationem sui operis, ut quodam modo miraculum videatur operari. And again, qu. 110, art. 4: Miraculum proprie dicitur, cum aliquid fit præter ordinem naturæ. Sed non sufficit ad rationem miraculi, si quid fiat præter ordinem naturæ alicujus particularis; quia sic, cum aliquis projicit lapidem sursum, miraculum faceret, cum hoc fit præter ordinem naturæ lapidis. Ex hoc ergo aliquid dicitur miraculum, quod fit præter ordinem totius naturæ creatæ. Hoc autem non potest facere nisi Deus.

[1] The principal argument against this, is the fact that inexplicable feats of exactly like kinds are done by the modern Egyptian charmers; some are recounted in the great French work upon Egypt, and attested by keen and sharp-sighted observers. But taking into consideration all which we know about these magicians, that they apparently have always

Else, unless it had been such a conflict as this, what meaning would such passages have as that in Moses' Song, 'Who is like unto thee, O Lord, among the gods?' (Exod. xv. 11); or that earlier, '*Against all the gods* of Egypt I will execute judgment; I am the Lord' (Exod. xii. 12; cf. Numb. xxxiii. 4)? As it was *then*, so probably was it again at the Incarnation, for Satan's open encounter of our Lord in the wilderness was but one form of his manifold opposition; and we have a hint of a resistance similar to that of the Egyptian magicians in the 'withstanding' of Paul ascribed to Elymas (Acts xiii. 8; cf. 2 Tim. iii. 8).[1] But whether at that time it was so, or not, so will it be certainly at the end of the world (Matt. xxiv. 24; 2 Thess. ii. 9; Rev. xiii. 13). Thus it seems that at each great crisis and epoch of the kingdom, the struggle between the light and the darkness, which has ever been going forward, comes out into visible manifestation.

Yet while the works of Antichrist and his organs are not mere tricks and juggleries, neither are they miracles in the very highest sense of the word; they only in part partake of the essential elements of the miracle.[2] This

constituted an hereditary guild, that the charmer throws himself into an ecstatic state, the question remains, how far there may not be here a wreck and surviving fragment of a mightier system, how far the charmers do not even now, consciously or unconsciously, bring themselves into relation with those evil powers, which more or less remotely do at the last underlie every form of heathen superstition. On this subject see Hengstenberg (*Die Bücher Mose's und Aegypten*, pp. 97–103). I have had no opportunity of consulting Dierenger's apologetic work, *On Heathen Magic, Divination, and Soothsaying*; but doubt not that it must contain much of interest on this and kindred matters.

[1] According to Gregory the Great (*Moral.* xxxiv. 3) one of the hardest trials of the elect in the last great tribulation will be, the far more glorious miracles which Antichrist shall show, than any which the Church shall then be allowed to accomplish. From the Church signs and wonders will be well nigh or altogether withdrawn, while the greatest and most startling of these will be at his beck.

[2] 'Therefore hath God reserved to Himself the power of miracles as a prerogative; for the devil does no miracles; the devil and his instruments do but hasten nature, or hinder nature, antedate nature, or postdate nature, bring things sooner to pass, or retard them; and how-

they have, indeed, in common with it, that they are real works of a power which is suffered to reach thus far, and not merely dexterous feats of legerdemain; but this, also, which is most different, that they are abrupt, isolated, parts of no organic whole; not the highest harmonies, but the deepest discords, of the universe;[1] not the omnipotence of God wielding his own worlds to ends of grace and wisdom and love, but evil permitted to intrude into the hidden springs of things just so far as may suffice for its own deeper confusion in the end, and, in the mean while, for the needful trial and perfecting of God's saints and servants.[2]

This fact, however, that the kingdom of lies has its wonders no less than the kingdom of truth, is itself sufficient evidence that miracles cannot be appealed to absolutely and finally, in proof of the doctrine which the worker of them proclaims; and God's word expressly declares the same (Deut. xiii. 1–5). A miracle does not prove the truth of a doctrine, or the divine mission of him that brings it to pass. That which alone it claims for him at the first is a right to be listened to: it puts him in the alternative of being from heaven or from hell. The doctrine must first commend itself to the conscience as being *good*, and only then can the miracle seal it as *divine*.[3]

soever they pretend to oppose nature, yet still it is but upon nature, and but by natural means, that they work. Facit mirabilia magna solus, says David [Ps. cxxxvi. 4]; there are mirabilia parva, some lesser wonders, that the devil and his instruments, Pharaoh's sorcerers, can do; but when it comes to mirabilia magna, great wonders, so great as that they amount to the nature of a miracle, facit solus, God and God only does them.'—Donne, *Sermons*, p. 215.

[1] They have the veritas *formæ*, but not the veritas *finis*.

[2] See Augustine, *De Trin.* iii. 7–9.

[3] Jeremy Taylor (*Liberty of Prophesying*): 'Although the argument drawn from miracles is good to attest a holy doctrine, which by its own worth will support itself after way is a little made by miracles; yet of itself and by its own reputation it will not support any fabric; for instead of proving a doctrine to be true, it makes that the miracles themselves are suspected to be illusions, if they be pretended in behalf of a doctrine which we think we have reason to account false.'

But the first appeal is from the doctrine to the conscience, to the moral nature in man. For all revelation presupposes in man a power of recognizing the truth when it is shown him,—that it will find an answer in him,—that he will trace in it the lineaments of a friend, though of a friend from whom he has been long estranged, and whom he has well nigh forgotten. It is the finding of a treasure, but of a treasure which he himself and no other had lost. The denial of this, that there is in man any organ by which truth may be recognized, opens the door to a boundless scepticism, is indeed the denial of all that is godlike in man. But 'he that is of God, heareth God's word,' and recognizes it for that which it proclaims itself to be.

It may be objected, indeed, If this be so, if there be this inward witness of the truth, what need then of the miracle? to what end does it serve, when the truth has accredited itself already? It has indeed accredited itself as good, as *from* God in the sense that all of good and true is from Him, as whatever was precious in the teaching even of heathen sage or poet was from Him;—but not as yet as a new word directly from Him, a new speaking on his part to man. The miracle shall be credentials for the bearer of that good word, a manifest sign that he has a special mission for the realization of the purposes of God with man. When the truth has found a receptive heart, has awoke deep echoes in the innermost soul of man, he who brings it may thus show that he stands yet nearer to God than others, that he is to be heard not merely as one that is true, but as himself the Truth (see Matt. xi. 4, 5; John v. 36); or at least, as a messenger standing in direct connexion with Him who is the Truth (1 Kin. xiii. 3); claiming unreserved submission, and the reception, upon his authority, of other statements which transcend the mind of man—mysteries, which though, of course, not *against* that measure and standard of truth which God has

given unto every man, yet cannot be weighed or measured by it.

To demand such a sign from one who comes professing to be the utterer of a new revelation, the bringer of a direct message from God, to demand this, even when the word already commends itself as good, is no mark of unbelief, but on the contrary is a duty upon his part to whom the message is brought. Else might he lightly be persuaded to receive that as from God, which, indeed, was only the word of man. Credulity is as real, if not so great, a sin as unbelief. It was no impiety on the part of Pharaoh to say to Moses and Aaron, 'Show a miracle for you' (Exod. vii. 9, 10); on the contrary, it was altogether right for him to require this. They came, averring they had a message for him from God: it was his duty to put them to the proof. His sin began, when he refused to believe their credentials. On the other hand, it was a mark of unbelief in Ahaz (Isai. vii. 10–13), however he might disguise it, that he *would not* ask a sign from God in confirmation of the prophet's word. Had that word been more precious to him, he would not have been satisfied till the seal was set to it; and that he did not care for the seal was a sure evidence that he did not truly care for the promise which should receive the seal.

But the purpose of the miracle being, as we have seen, to confirm that which is good, so, upon the other hand, where the mind and conscience witness against the doctrine, not all the miracles in the world have a right to demand submission to the word which they seal.[1] On the contrary, the supreme act of faith is to believe, against, and in despite of, them all, in what God has revealed, and implanted in the soul, of the holy and the true; not to

[1] As Gregory the Great says well, the Church does not so much *deny*, as *despise* the miracles of heretics (*Moral.* xx. 7): Sancta Ecclesia, etiam si qua fiunt hæreticorum miracula, despicit; quia hæc sanctitatis specimen non esse cognoscit.

believe another Gospel, though an Angel from heaven, or one transformed into such, should bring it (Deut. xiii. 3; Gal. i. 8);[1] and instead of compelling assent, miracles are then rather warnings to us that we keep them and their workers aloof, for they tell us that not merely lies are here, for to that the conscience bore witness already, but that he who utters them is more than a common deceiver, is eminently 'a liar and an Antichrist,' a false prophet,—standing in more immediate connexion than other deceived and evil men to the kingdom of darkness, so that Satan has given him his power (Rev. xiii. 2), is using him to be an especial organ of his, and to do a peculiar work for him.[2]

But if these things are so, there may seem a twofold danger to which the simple and unlearned Christian would be exposed—the danger, first, of not receiving that which indeed comes from God, or secondly, of receiving that which comes from an evil source. But indeed these dangers do not beset the unlearned and the simple more than they

[1] Augustine (*De Civ. Dei*, x. 16): Si tantum hi [angeli] mirabilibus factis humanas permoverent mentes, qui sacrificia sibi expetunt: illi autem qui hoc prohibent, et uni tantum Deo sacrificari jubent, nequaquam ista visibilia miracula facere dignarentur, profecto non sensu corporis, sed ratione mentis præponenda eorum esset auctoritas. So to the Manichæans he says (*Con. Faust.* xiii. 5): Miracula non facitis; quæ si faceretis, etiam ipsa in vobis caveremus, præstruente nos Domino, et dicente, Exsurgent multi pseudo-christi et pseudo-prophetæ, et facient signa et prodigia multa. Theodoret too comments on Deut. xiii. 3 thus: *διδασκόμεθα μὴ προσέχειν σημείοις, ὅταν ὁ ταῦτα δρῶν ἐναντία τῇ εὐσεβείᾳ διδάσκει.*

[2] Thus Irenæus (*Adv. Hær.* II. xxxi. 3) calls such deceitful workers 'precursors of the great Dragon,' quos similiter atque illum devitare oportet, et quanto majore phantasmate operari dicuntur, tanto magis observare eos, quasi majorem nequitiæ spiritum perceperint. And Tertullian, refuting Gnostics, who argued that there was no need that Christ should have been prophesied of beforehand, since He could at once prove his mission by his miracles [per documenta virtutum], replies (*Adv. Marc.* iii. 3): At ego negabo solam hanc illi speciem ad testimonium competisse, quam et Ipse postmodum exauctoravit. Siquidem edicens multos venturos, et signa facturos, et virtutes magnas edituros, aversionem [eversionem?] etiam electorum, nec ideo tamen admittendos, temerariam signorum et virtutum fidem ostendit, ut etiam apud pseudo-christos facillimarum.

beset and form part of the trial and temptation of every man; the safeguard from either of these fatal errors lying altogether in men's moral and spiritual, and not at all in their intellectual, condition. They only find the witness which the truth bears to itself to be no witness, they only believe the lying wonders, in whom the moral sense is already perverted; they have not before received and embraced the love of the truth, that they might be saved from believing a lie. Thus, then, their believing this lie and rejecting that truth is, in fact, but the final judgment upon them that have had pleasure in unrighteousness. With this view exactly agree the memorable words of St. Paul (2 Thess. ii. 9–12), wherein he declares that it is the anterior state of every man which shall decide whether he shall receive the lying wonders of Antichrist or reject them (cf. John v. 43).[1] For while such come 'with all deceivableness of unrighteousness' to them whose previous condition has fitted them to embrace them, who have been ripening themselves for this crowning judgment, there is ever some fault in these wonders, something false, or immoral, or ostentatious, or something merely idle, which detects and lays them bare to a simple faith, and broadly differences them and their doers from such as belong to the kingdom of the truth.[2]

These differences have been often brought out. Such miracles are immoral;[3] or if not immoral, they are idle,

[1] Augustine (*De Civ. Dei*, xx. 19): Seducentur eis signis atque prodigiis qui seduci merebuntur. Proinde judicati seducentur, et seducti judicabuntur.

[2] 'You complain,' says Dr. Arnold, in a letter to Dr. Hawkins (*Life*, vol. ii. p. 226), 'of those persons who judge of a revelation not by its evidence, but by its substance. It has always seemed to me that its substance is a most essential part of its evidence; and that miracles wrought in favour of what was foolish or wicked, would only prove Manicheism. We are so perfectly ignorant of the unseen world, that the character of any supernatural power can only be judged by the moral character of the statements which it sanctions. Thus only can we tell whether it be a revelation from God or from the Devil.'

[3] Thus Arnobius (*Adv. Gen.* i. 43) of the heathen wonder-workers:

leading to and ending in nothing. For as the miracle, standing in connexion with highest moral ends, must not be itself an immoral act, as little may it be an act merely futile, issuing in vanity and nothingness. This argument Origen continually uses, when plied with the alleged miracles of heathen saints and sages. He counts, and rightly, that he has abundantly convinced them of falsehood, when he has asked, and obtained no answer to, this question, 'What came of these? In what did they issue? Where is the Society which has been founded by their aid? What is there in the world's history which they have helped forward, to show that they lay deep in the mind and counsel of God? The miracles of Moses issued in a Jewish polity; those of Jesus Christ in a Christian Church; whole nations were knit together through their help.[1] What have your boasted Apollonius or Æsculapius to show as the fruit of theirs? What traces of their greatness have they left behind them?'[2] And not merely, he goes on to say, were Christ's miracles effectual, but effectual for good,—and such good was their distinct purpose and aim; for this is the characteristic distinction between the dealer in false shows of power and the true worker of divine works, that the latter has ever the reformation of men in his eye, and seeks always to forward this; while the first, whose own work is built upon fraud and lies, can have no such purpose of destroying that very kingdom out of which he himself grows.[3]

Quis enim hos nesciat aut imminentia studere prænoscere, quæ necessario (velint nolint) suis ordinationibus veniunt? aut mortiferam immittere quibus libuerit tabem, aut familiarium dirumpere caritates: aut sine clavibus reserare, quæ clausa sunt; aut ora silentio vincire, aut in curriculis equos debilitare, incitare, tardare; aut uxoribus et liberis alienis (sive illi mares sint, sive feminei generis) inconcessi amoris flammas et furiales immittere cupiditates? Cf. Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* II. xxxi. 2, 3.

[1] *Con. Cels.* ii. 51: Ἐθνῶν ὅλων συστάντων μετὰ τὰ σημεῖα αὐτῶν.

[2] *Ibid.* i. 67: Δεικνύτωσαν ἡμῖν Ἕλληνες τῶν κατειλεγμένων τινὸς βιωφελὲς, λαμπρὸν, καὶ παρατεῖναν ἐπὶ τὰς ὕστερον γενεὰς, καὶ τηλικοῦτον ἔργον, ὡς ἐμποιεῖν πιθανότητα τῷ περὶ αὐτῶν μύθῳ, λέγοντι ἀπὸ θείας αὐτοὺς γεγονέναι σποράς: cf. iii. 28.

[3] *Ibid.* i. 68; cf. Eusebius, *Dem. Evang.* iii. 6.

These, too, are marks of the true miracle, and marks very nearly connected with the foregoing, that it is never a mere freak of power, done as in wantonness, with no need compelling, for display and ostentation.[1] With good right in that remarkable religious romance of earliest Christian times, *The Recognitions of Clement*,[2] and in the cognate *Clementine Homilies*,[3] Peter draws a contrast between the wonderful works of Christ and those alleged by the followers of Simon Magus to have been wrought by their master. What profit, he asks, or what significance was there in Simon's speaking statues, his dogs of brass or stone that barked, his flights through the air, his transformations of himself now into a serpent, now into a goat, his putting on of two faces, his rolling himself unhurt upon burning coals, and the like?—which all even if he had done, and much more in the same fashion, the works possessed no meaning; they stood in relation to nothing; they were not, what each true miracle will always be more or less, *redemptive* acts; in other words, works not merely of power but of grace, each one an index and a prophecy of the inner work of man's deliverance, which it accompanies and helps forward.[4] But, as we should justly expect, it was preëminently thus with the miracles of Christ. Each of these is in small, and upon one side or another, a partial and transient realization of the great work which He came

[1] Gerson (*De Distinct. Ver. Mirac.*): Miraculum, si piâ utilitate aut necessitate careat, eo facto suspectum est. And Pope Benedict XIV. in his learned work on Canonization says well, Miracula falsa a veris discernuntur efficaciâ, utilitate, modo, fine, personâ et occasione.

[2] iii. 6 (Cotelerii *Patt. Apost.* vol. i. p. 529).

[3] *Hom.* ii. 32–44 (*ibid.* p. 629).

[4] *Hom.* iii. 60 (*ibid.* p. 529): Nam dic, quæso, quæ utilitas est ostendere statuas ambulantes? latrare æreos aut lapideos canes? salire montes? volare per aërem? et alia his similia, quæ dicitis fecisse Simonem? Quæ autem a Bono sunt, ad hominum salutem deferuntur; ut sunt illa quæ fecit Dominus noster, qui fecit cæcos videre, fecit surdos audire; debiles et claudos erexit, languores et dæmones effugavit. . . . Ista ergo signa quæ ad salutem hominum prosunt, et aliquid boni hominibus conferunt, Malignus facere non potest. Cf. Irenæus, *Con. Hær.* II. xxxii. 3.

that in the end He might accomplish perfectly and for ever. They are all pledges, in that they are themselves first-fruits of his power; in each of them the *word* of salvation is incorporated in an *act* of salvation. Only when regarded in this light do they appear not merely as illustrious examples of his might, but also as glorious manifestations of his holy love.[1]

It is worth while to follow this a little in detail. What evils are they, which hinder man from reaching the true end and aim of his creation, and from which he needs a redemption? It may briefly be answered that they are sin in its moral and in its physical manifestations. If we regard its moral manifestations, in the darkness of the understanding, in the wild discords of the spiritual life, none were such fearful examples of its tyranny as the demoniacs; they were special objects, therefore, of the miraculous power of the Lord. Then if we ask ourselves what are the physical manifestations of sin; they are sicknesses of all kinds, fevers, palsies, leprosies, blindness, each of these death beginning, a partial death—and finally, the death absolute of the body. This region therefore is fitly another, as it is the widest region, of his redemptive grace. In the conquering and removing of these evils, He eminently bodied forth the idea of Himself as the Saviour and Redeemer of men. But besides these, sin has its manifestations more purely physical; it reveals itself and its consequences in the tumults and strife of the elements among themselves, as in the rebellion of nature against

[1] No one will, I think, deny to the historian Niebuhr the possession in a very high degree of that critical faculty, which judges of the credibility, or the contrary, of events presented as true, and this is his remarkable testimony on this matter (*Lebensnachrichten*, vol. i. p. 470): Was nun Wunder im strengsten Sinne betrifft, so bedarf es wahrhaftig nur einer unbefangenen und scharfblickenden Naturforschung damit wir einsehen, dass die erzählten der christlichen Geschichte nichts weniger als widersinnig sind, und einer Vergleichung mit Legendenmärchen oder den angeblichen anderer Religionen um wahrzunehmen, welch ein anderer Geist in ihnen lebt.

man; for the destinies of the natural world were linked to the destinies of man; and when he fell, he drew after him his whole inheritance, which became subject to the same vanity as himself. Therefore do we behold Him, in whom the lost prerogatives of the race were recovered, walking on the stormy waves, or quelling the menace of the sea with his word; incorporating in these acts the deliverance of man from the rebellious powers of nature, which had risen up against him, and instead of his willing servants, were oftentimes now his tyrants and his destroyers. These also were redemptive acts. Even the two or three of his works which do not range themselves so readily under any of these heads, yet are not indeed exceptions. Take, for example, the multiplying of the bread. The original curse of sin was the curse of barrenness,—the earth yielding hard-won and scanty returns to the sweat and labour of man; but here this curse is removed, and in its stead the primeval abundance for a moment re-appears. All scantness and scarceness, such as this lack of bread in the wilderness, that failing of the wine at the marriage-feast, were not man's portion at the first; for all the earth was appointed to serve him, and to pour the fulness of its treasure into his lap. That he ever should hunger or thirst, that he should ever have lack of anything, was a consequence of Adam's sin,—fitly, therefore, removed by Him, the second Adam, who came to restore to him all which had been forfeited by the first.

The miracle, then, being this ethical act, and only to be received when it is so, and when it seals doctrines of holiness, the forgetting or failing to bring forward the fact that the divine miracle must, of necessity, move in this sphere of redemption only, that the doctrine also is to try the miracle, as well as the miracle to seal the doctrine, is a dangerous omission on the part of some who, in modern times, have written '*Evidences of Christianity*,' and have found in the miracles wrought by its Founder, and in

these mainly as acts of power, well-nigh the exclusive argument for its reception as a divine revelation. On the place which these works should take in the array of proofs for the things which we believe, there will be occasion, by and bye, to speak. For the present it may be sufficient to observe, that if men are taught to believe in Christ upon no other grounds than because He attested his claims by works of wonder, while on these grounds they have no choice but so to do, how shall they consistently refuse belief to any other, who may come hereafter attesting his claims by the same? We have here a paving of the way of Antichrist; for as we know that he will have his 'signs and wonders' (2 Thess. ii. 9; Matt. xxiv. 23–26), so, if this argument is good, he will have right on the score of these to demand the faith and allegiance of men. But no; the miracle must witness for itself, and the doctrine must witness for itself, and then, and then only, the first is capable of witnessing for the second;[1] and those books of Christian Evidences are maimed and imperfect, fraught with the most perilous consequences, which reverence in the miracle little else but its power, and see in that alone what gives either to it its attesting worth, or to the doctrine its authority as adequately attested truth.

[1] Gerhard (*Loc. Theoll.* loc. xxiii. 11): Miracula sunt doctrinæ tesseræ ac sigilla; quemadmodum igitur sigillum a literis avulsum nihil probat, ita quoque miracula sine doctrinâ nihil valent.

CHAPTER IV.

THE EVANGELICAL, COMPARED WITH OTHER CYCLES OF MIRACLES.

1. The Miracles of the Old Testament.

THE miracles of our Lord and those of the Old Testament afford many interesting points of comparison, a comparison equally instructive, whether we trace the points of likeness, or of unlikeness, which exist between them. Thus, to note first a remarkable difference, we find oftentimes the holy men of the older Covenant bringing, if one may venture so to speak, hardly, and with difficulty, the wonder-work to pass; it is not born without pangs; there is sometimes a momentary pause, a seeming uncertainty about the issue; while the miracles of Christ are always accomplished with the highest ease; He speaks, and it is done. Thus Moses must plead and struggle with God, 'Heal her now, O God, I beseech Thee,' before the plague of leprosy is removed from his sister, and not even so can he instantaneously win the boon (Num. xii. 13–15); but Christ heals a leper by his touch (Matt. viii. 3), or ten with even less than this, merely by the power of his will and at a distance[1] (Luke xvii. 14). Elijah must pray long, and his servant go up seven times, before tokens of the rain appear (1 Kin. xviii. 42–44); he stretches himself thrice on the child and cries unto the

[1] Cyril of Alexandria (Cramer's *Cat. in Luc.* v. 12) has observed and drawn out the contrast.

Lord, and painfully wins back its life (1 Kin. xvii. 21, 22); and Elisha, with yet more of effort and only after partial failure (2 Kin. iv. 31–35), restores the child of the Shunammite to life. Christ, on the other hand, shows Himself the Lord of the living and the dead, raising the dead with as much ease as He performs the commonest transactions of life.—In the miracles wrought by men, glorious acts of faith as they are, for they are ever wrought in reliance on the strength and faithfulness of God, who will follow up and seal his servant's word, it is yet possible for human impatience and human unbelief to break out. Thus Moses, God's instrument though he be for the work of power, speaks hastily and acts unbelievingly (Num. xx. 11). It is needless to say of the Son, that his confidence ever remains the same, that his Father hears Him always; no admixture of the slightest human infirmity mars the completeness of his work.

Where the miracles are similar in kind, Christ's are larger, freer, and more glorious. Elisha, indeed, feeds a hundred men with twenty loaves (2 Kin. iv. 42–44), but He five thousand with five.[1] Others have their instrument of power to which the wonder-working energy is linked. Thus Moses has his rod, his staff of wonder, wherewith to divide the Red Sea, and to accomplish his other mighty acts; without which he is nothing (Exod. vii. 19; viii. 5, 16; ix. 23; x. 13; xiv. 16, &c.); his tree to heal the bitter waters (Exod. xv. 25); Elijah divides the river with his mantle (2 Kin. ii. 8); Elisha heals the spring with a cruse of salt (2 Kin. ii. 20). But Christ accomplishes his miracles simply by the agency of his word (Matt. xii. 13), or by a touch (Matt. viii. 3; xx. 34); or if He takes any material substance as the conductor of his healing power,

[1] Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* iv. 35): Aliter Dominus per semet ipsum operatur, sive per Filium; aliter per prophetas famulos suos; maxime documenta virtutis et potestatis; quæ ut clariora et validiora, qua propria. distare a vicariis fas est.

it is from Himself He takes it (Mark vii. 33; viii. 23);[1] or should He, as once He does, use any foreign medium in part (John ix. 6), yet by other miracles of like kind, in which He has recourse to no such extraneous helps, He declares plainly that this was of free choice, and not of necessity. Then too, which is but another side of the same truth, while the miracles of Moses, or of the Apostles, are ever done in the name of another and with the attribution of the glory to another, 'Stand still and see the salvation of the Lord, which *He* will show you' (Exod. xiv. 13), 'In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth rise up and walk' (Acts iii. 6), 'Æneas, Jesus Christ maketh thee whole' (Acts ix. 34; cf. Mark xvi. 17; Luke x. 17; John xiv. 10); his are ever wrought in his own name and by a power immanent and inherent in Himself: '*I will*, be thou clean' (Matt. viii. 3); 'Thou deaf and dumb spirit, *I* charge thee come out of him' (Mark ix. 25); 'Young man, *I* say unto thee, Arise' (Luke vii. 14).[2] When He prays, being about to perform one of his mighty works, his disciples shall learn even from his prayer itself that herein He is not asking for a power external to Himself, but indeed only testifying thus to the unbroken oneness of his life with his Father's (John xi. 41, 42);[3] just as on another occasion He will not suffer his disciples to suppose that it is for other than their sakes that the testimony from heaven is borne unto Him (John xii. 30). Thus needful was it for

[1] In the East the Mahomedans had probably a sense of this fitness that Christ should find all in Himself, when they made his healing virtue to have resided in his breath (Tholuck, *Blüthensamml. aus d. Morgenl. Myst.* p. 62); to which also they were led as being the purest and least material effluence of the body (cf. John xx. 22). So Abgarus, in the apocryphal letter which bears his name, magnifies Christ's healings, in that they were done ἄνευ φαρμάκων καὶ βοτανῶν. Arnobius too (*Adv. Gent.* i. 43, 44, 48, 52) lays great stress upon the point, that all which He did was done sine ullis adminiculis rerum; he is comparing, it is true, our Lord's miracles with the lying wonders of the γόητες, not with the only relatively inferior of the Old Testament.

[2] See Pearson, *On the Creed*, Art. 2; Gerhard, *Loc. Theoll.* loc. iv. 5, 59.

[3] Cf. Ambrose, *De Fide*, iii. 4.

them, thus needful for all, that they should have high and exclusive thoughts of Him, and should not class Him with any other, even the greatest and holiest of the children of men.

These likenesses, and these unlikenesses no less, are such as beforehand we should naturally expect. We should expect the mighty works of either Covenant to be like, since the old and new form parts of one organic whole; and it is ever God's law, alike in the kingdom of nature and of grace, that the lower should contain the germs and prophetic intimations and anticipations of the higher. We should expect them to be unlike, since the very idea of God's kingdom is that of progress, of a gradually fuller communication and larger revelation of Himself to men, so that He who in times past spake unto the fathers by the prophets, did at length speak unto us by his Son; and it was only meet that this Son should be clothed with mightier powers than theirs, and powers which He held not from another, but such as were evidently his own in fee.[1]

This, too, explains a difference in the character of the miracles of the two Covenants, and how it comes to pass that those of the Old wear oftentimes a far severer aspect than those of the New. They are miracles, indeed, of God's grace, but yet also miracles of the Law, of that Law which worketh wrath, which will teach, at all costs, the lesson of the awful holiness of God, his hatred of the sinner's sin,—a lesson which men needed thoroughly to learn, lest they should mistake and abuse the new lesson which a Saviour taught, of God's love at the same time toward the sinner himself. Miracles of the Law, they

[1] Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* iii. passim) urges this well. Eusebius (*Dem. Evang.* iii. 2) traces in the same way the parallelisms between the life of Moses and of Christ. They supposed that in so doing they were, if anything, confirming the truth of each, though now the assailants of Revelation will have it that these coincidences are only calculated to cast suspicion upon both.

preserve a character that accords with the Law; being oftentimes fearful outbreaks of God's anger against the unrighteousness of men; such for instance are the signs and wonders in Egypt, many of those in the desert (Num. xvi. 31; Lev. x. 2), and some which the later prophets wrought (2 Kin. i. 10-12; ii. 23-25); leprosies are inflicted (Num. xii. 10; 2 Chr. xxvi. 19), not removed; a sound hand is withered and dried up (1 Kin. xiii. 4), not a withered hand restored. Not but that these works also are for the most part what our Lord's are altogether and with no single exception, namely, works of evident grace and mercy. I affirm this of *all* our Lord's miracles; for that single one, which seems an exception, the cursing of the barren fig-tree, has no right really to be considered such. Indeed it is difficult to see how our blessed Lord could more strikingly have shown his purpose of preserving throughout for his miracles their character of beneficence, or have witnessed for Himself that He was come not to destroy men's lives but to save them, than in this circumstance,—that when He needed in this very love to declare, not in word only but in act, what would be the consequences of an obstinate unfruitfulness and resistance to his grace, and thus to make manifest the severer side of his ministry, He should have chosen for the showing out of this, not one among all the sinners who were about Him, but displayed his power upon a tree, which, itself incapable of feeling, might yet effectually serve as a sign and warning to men. He will allow no single exception to the rule of grace and love.[1] When He

[1] Lord Bacon (*Meditationes Sacræ*) on the words, Bene omnia fecit (Mark vii. 37), in which he sees rightly an allusion to Gen. i. 31, goes on to say: Verus plausus: Deus cum universa crearet, vidit quod singula et omnia erant bona nimis. Deus, Verbum in miraculis quæ edidit (omne autem miraculum est nova creatio, et non ex lege primæ creationis) nil facere voluit, quod non gratiam et beneficentiam omnino spiraret. Moses edidit miracula, et profligavit Ægyptios pestibus multis: Elias edidit, et occlusit cælum ne plueret super terram; et rursus eduxit de cælo ignem Dei super duces et cohortes; Elizæus edidit, et evocavit ursas e

blesses, it is men; but when He smites, it is an unfeeling tree.[1]

It is also noticeable that the region in which the miracles of the Old Testament chiefly move, is that of external nature; they are the dividing of the sea (Exod. xiv. 21), or of a river (Josh. iii. 14; 2 Kin. ii. 8, 14), the yawning of the earth (Num. xvi. 31), fire falling down from heaven (1 Kin. xviii. 38; 2 Kin. i. 10, 12), furnaces which have lost their power to consume (Dan. iii.), wild-beasts which have laid aside their inborn fierceness in whole (Dan. vi. 22), or in part (1 Kin. xiii. 24, 28), and the like. Not of course that there are no other miracles but these in the Old Testament; but this nature is the haunt and main region of the miracle there, as in the New it is mainly the sphere of man's life in which it moves. And consistently with this, the earlier miracles, done as most of them were in the presence of the giant powers of heathendom, have oftentimes a colossal character. Those powers of the world are strong, but the God of Israel will show Himself to be stronger than them all. Thus it is with the miracles of Egypt, the miracles of Babylon: they are

deserto, quæ laniarent impuberes; Petrus Ananiam sacrilegum hypocritam morte, Paulus Elymam magum cæcitate, percussit: sed nihil hujusmodi fecit Jesus. Descendit super eum Spiritus in formâ columbæ, de quo dixit, Nescitis cujus Spiritûs sitis. Spiritus Jesu, spiritus columbinus: fuerunt illi servi Dei tanquam boves Dei triturantes granum, et conculcantes paleam; sed Jesus agnus Dei sine irâ et judiciis. Omnia ejus miracula circa corpus humanum, et doctrina ejus circa animam humanam. Indiget corpus hominis alimento, defensione ab externis, et curâ. Ille multitudinem piscium in retibus congregavit, ut uberiorem victum hominibus præberet; ille alimentum aquæ in dignius alimentum vini ad exhilarandum cor hominis convertit: ille ficum quod officio suo ad quod destinatum fuit, ad cibum hominis videlicet, non fungeretur, arefieri jussit: ille penuriam panum et piscium ad alendum exercitum populi dilatavit: ille ventos, quod navigantibus minarentur, corripuit. . . . Nullum miraculum judicii, omnia beneficentiæ, et circa corpus humanum.

[1] From this point of view we should explain our Saviour's rebuke to the sons of Zebedee, when they wanted to call down fire from heaven on a village of the Samaritans, '*as Elias did*' (Luke ix. 54); to repeat, that is, an Old-Testament miracle.

miracles eminently of strength;[1] for under the influence of the great nature-worships of those lands, all religion had assumed a colossal grandeur in its outward manifestations. Compared with our Lord's works, wrought in the days of his flesh, those were the whirlwind and the fire, and his as the still small voice which followed. In that old time God was teaching his people, He was teaching also the nations with whom his people were brought wonderfully into contact, that He who had entered into covenant with one among all the nations, was not one god among many, the god of the hills, or the god of the plains (1 Kin. xx. 23); but that the God of Israel was the Lord of the whole earth, who wielded all its elements at his will.

But Israel at the time of the Incarnation had thoroughly learned that lesson, much else as it had still to learn; and the whole civilized world had practically outgrown polytheism, however as the popular superstition it may have lingered still. And thus the works of our Lord, though they bear not on their front the imposing character which did those of old, yet contain higher and deeper truths. They are eminently miracles of the Incarnation, of the Son of God who had taken our flesh, and who, having taken, would heal it. They have predominantly a relation to man's body and his spirit. Miracles of nature which move in the sphere of this assume now altogether a subordinate place. They still survive, even as we could ill afford wholly to have lost them; for this region of nature must still be claimed as part of Christ's

[1] We find the false Christs, who were so plentiful about the time of our Lord's coming, professing and promising to do exactly the same works as those wrought of yore,—to repeat and on a larger scale these Old-Testament miracles. Thus 'that Egyptian' whom the Roman tribune supposed that he saw in Paul (Acts xxi. 38), and of whom Josephus gives us a fuller account (*Antt.* xx. 8, 6), led a tumultuous crowd to the Mount of Olives, promising to show them from hence how, as a second and a greater Joshua, he would cause the walls, not of Jericho, but of Jerusalem, to fall to the ground at his bidding. See Vitringa, *De Signis a Messiâ edendis* in his *Obss. Sac.* vol. i. p. 482.

dominion, though not its chiefest or its noblest province. But man, and not nature, is now the main subject of these mighty powers; and thus it comes to pass that, with less of outward pomp, less to startle and amaze, the new have a far deeper inward significance than the old.[1]

2. The Miracles of the Apocryphal Gospels.

The apocryphal gospels, abject productions as, whether contemplated from a literary or a moral point of view, they must be regarded, are yet instructive in this respect, namely that they show us what manner of gospels were the result, when men drew from their own fancy, and devised Christs of their own, instead of resting upon the basis of fact, and delivering to the world faithful records of Him who indeed had lived and died among them. Here, as ever, the glory of the true comes out into strongest light by its comparison with the false. But in nothing, perhaps, are these apocryphal gospels more worthy of note, than in the difference between the main features of their miracles and of those of the canonical Gospels. Thus in the canonical, the miracle is indeed essential, but, at the same time, ever subordinated to the doctrine which it confirms,—a link in the great chain of God's manifestation of Himself to men; its ethical significance never falls into the background, but the wonder-work of grace and power has, in every case where this can find room, nearer or remoter reference to the moral condition of the person or persons in whose behalf it is wrought. The miracles ever lead us off from themselves to their Author; they appear as emanations from the glory of the Son of God;

[1] Julian the Apostate had indeed so little an eye for the glory of such works as these, that in one place he says (Cyril, *Adv. Jul.* vi.), Jesus did nothing wonderful, 'unless any should esteem that to have healed some lame and blind, and exorcised some demoniacs in villages like Bethsaida and Bethany, were very wonderful works.'

but it is in Him we rest, and not in them; they are but the halo round Him, and derive their worth from Him, not contrariwise He from them. They are held, too, together by his strong and central personality, which does not leave them a conglomerate of marvellous stories fortuitously heaped together, but parts of a vast organic whole, of which every part is in vital coherence with all the others. It is altogether otherwise with these apocryphal narratives. To say that the miracles occupy in them the foremost place would very inadequately express the facts of the case. They are everything. Some of these so-called histories are nothing else but a string of these; which yet (and this too is singularly characteristic) stand wholly disconnected from the ministry of Christ. Not one of them belongs to the period after his Baptism, but they are all miracles of the Infancy,—in other words, of that time whereof the canonical history relates no miracle, and not merely does not relate any, but is at pains to tell us that during it no miracle was wrought, the miracle in Cana of Galilee being his first (John ii. 11).

It follows of necessity that they are never seals of a word and doctrine which has gone before: they are never 'signs,' but at the best wonders and portents. Every higher purpose and aim is absent from them altogether. It is never felt that the writer is writing out of any higher motive than to excite and feed a childish love of the marvellous, never that he could say, 'These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name' (John xx. 31). Indeed, so far from having a *religious*, they are often wanting in an *ethical* element.[1] The Lord Jesus appears in them as a wayward, capricious, passionate child; to be feared indeed, seeing that He is furnished with such formidable powers of doing mischief, of

[1] See on this matter Nicolas, *Étude sur les Evangiles Apocryphes*, Paris, 1865.

avenging every wrong or accidental injury which He meets, every offence which He may take; and so bearing Himself, that the request which the parents of some other children are represented as making, that He may be kept within the house, bringing hurt and harm as He does wherever He comes, is abundantly justified by the facts; and indeed Joseph is reported to say to Mary, 'Whosoever sets himself against Him perishes,' and to acquiesce in the justice of their request.

It may be well to cite a few examples in proof, however unpleasantly some of them may jar on the Christian ear. Thus some children refuse to play with Him, hiding themselves from Him; He pursues and turns them into kids.[1] Another child by accident runs against Him, and throws Him down; whereupon He, being exasperated,[2] exclaims, 'As thou hast made Me to fall, so shalt thou fall and not rise;' at the same hour the child fell down and expired.[3] He has a dispute with the master who is teaching Him letters, concerning the order in which He shall go through the Hebrew alphabet, and his master strikes Him; whereupon Jesus curses him, and straightway his arm is withered, he falls on his face and dies.[4] His passionate readiness to avenge Himself shows itself at the very earliest age. At five years old He has made a pool of water, and is moulding sparrows from the clay. Another child, the son of a scribe, displeased that He should do this on the Sabbath, opens the sluices of his pool and lets out the water. On this Jesus is indignant, gives him many injurious names, and causes him to wither and wholly

[1] *Evang. Infant.* 40, in Thilo's *Codex Apocryphus*, p. 115: to whose excellent edition of the apocryphal gospels the references in this section are made throughout.

[2] Πικραν θείς.

[3] *Evang. Infant.* 47, p. 123; cf. *Evang. Thom.* 4, p. 284.

[4] *Evang. Infant.* 49, p. 125. In the *Evang. Thom.* 14, p. 307, he only falls into a swoon, and something afterwards pleasing Jesus (15), He raises him up again.

dry up with his curse.[1] Such is the image which the authors of these books give us of the holy child Jesus;—and yet we need not wonder; for man is not only unable to realize the perfect, he is unable to conceive it. The idea is as much a gift, as the power to realize that idea. Even the miracles which are not of this revolting character are childish tricks, like the tricks of a conjuror, never solemn acts of power and love. Jesus enters the shop of a dyer, who has received various cloths from various persons to be dyed of divers colours. In the absence of the master, He throws them all into the dyeing vat together, and when the dyer returns and remonstrates, draws them out of the vat, each dyed according to the colour which was enjoined.[2] He and some other children make birds and animals of clay; while each is boasting the superiority of his work, Jesus says, 'I will cause those which I have made to go;'—which they do, the animals leaping and the birds flying, and at his bidding returning, and eating and drinking from his hand.[3] While yet an infant at his mother's breast, He bids a palm-tree to stoop that she may pluck the dates; it obeys, and only returns to its position at his command.[4] His mother sends Him to the well for water; the pitcher breaks, and He brings the water in his cloak.[5] And as the miracles which He does, so those that are done in his honour, are idle or monstrous; the ox and the ass worshipping Him, a new-born infant in the crib, may serve for an example.[6]

In all these, as will be observed, the idea of *redemptive* acts is wanting altogether; they are none of them the outward clothing of the inward facts of man's redemption. I would not of course imply that miracles of heal-

[1] *Evang. Thom.* 3, p. 282. This appears with variations in the *Evang. Infant.* 46, p. 122.

[2] *Evang. Infant.* 37, p. 111.

[3] *Ibid.* 36. [4] *Ibid.* p. 395. [5] *Ibid.* p. 121.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 382.

ing and of grace are *altogether* absent from these books;[1] that would evidently have been incompatible with any idea of a Redeemer; but only that they do not present to us any clear and consistent image of a Saviour full of grace and power, but an image rather, continually distorted and defaced by lines of passion and caprice, of impatience, peevishness, and anger. The most striking, perhaps, of the miracles respecting the child Jesus, is that of the falling down of the idols of Egypt at his presence in the land; for it has in it something of a deeper significance, as a symbol and prophecy of the overthrow of the idol worship of the world by Him who was now coming into the world.[2] Again, the lions and the leopards gathering harmlessly round Him as He passed through the desert on the way to Egypt, is not alien to the true spirit of the Gospel, and has its analogy in the words of St. Mark, that He 'was with the wild-beasts' (i. 13); words not introduced merely to enhance the savageness of the wilderness where He spent those forty days of temptation, but a hint to us that in Him, the new head of the race, the second Adam, the Paradisaical state was given back (Gen. i. 28; Ps. viii. 6–8). But with a very few such partial exceptions as these, the apocryphal gospels are a barren and dreary waste of wonders without object or aim; and only instructive as making us strongly to feel, more strongly than otherwise we might have felt, how needful are other factors besides power for the producing of a true miracle; that wisdom and love must be there also; that where men conceive of power as its chiefest element, they give us only a hateful mockery of the divine. Had a Christ, such as these gospels portray, actually lived upon the earth, he

[1] For instance, Simon the Canaanite (*ibid.* p. 117) is healed, while yet a child, of the bite of a serpent. Yet even in miracles such as this there is always something which will not suffer us to forget that we are moving in another world from that in which the sacred Evangelists plant us.

[2] *Evang. Infant.* 10–12, pp. 75–77; cf. 1 Sam. v. 3, 4.

would have been no more than a potent and wayward magician, from whom all men would have shrunk with a natural instinct of distrust and fear.

3. The Later, or Ecclesiastical, Miracles.

It would plainly lead much too far from the subject in hand to enter into any detailed examination of the authority with which the later, or, as they may be conveniently termed, the ecclesiastical, miracles come to us, the demands which they make on our belief. Yet a few words must of necessity find place concerning the permanent miraculous gifts which have been challenged for the Church as her rightful heritage, alike by some who have gloried in their presumed presence, and by others who have lamented their absence—by those who have seen in their presence the evidences of her sanctity, in their absence, of her degeneracy and fall. It is not my belief that she has this gift of working miracles, nor yet that she was intended to have and only through her own unfaithfulness has lost it; nor that her Lord has abridged her of aught that would have made her strong and glorious in not endowing her with powers such as these. With reasons enough for humbling herself, I cannot think that among those is to be reckoned her inability to perform these works that should transcend nature. So many in our own day have arrived at a directly opposite conclusion, that it will be needful briefly to justify the opinion here expressed.

At first, as a strong presumption against the intended continuance of these powers in the Church, may be taken the analogies derived from the earlier history of God's dealings with his people. We do not find the miracles sown broadcast over the whole Old-Testament history, but they all cluster round a very few eminent persons, and have reference to certain great epochs and crises of the

kingdom of God. Abraham, the 'friend of God' and 'father of the faithful,'—David, the theocratic king,—Daniel, the 'man greatly beloved,' are alike entirely without them; that is, they *do* no miracles; such may be accomplished in their behalf, but they themselves accomplish none. In fact there are but two great outbursts of these; the first, at the establishing of the kingdom under Moses and Joshua, when, as at once is evident, they could not have been wanting; the second in the time of Elijah and Elisha; that also a time of the utmost need, when, the Levitical priesthood being abolished, and the faithful only a scattered few among the ten tribes, it was a question whether the court-religion which the apostate kings of Israel had set up, should not quite overbear the true worship of Jehovah. Then, in that decisive epoch of the kingdom's history, the two great prophets, they too in a subordinate sense the beginners of a new period, arose, equipped with powers which should witness that He whose servants *they* were, was the God of Israel, however Israel might refuse to acknowledge *Him*. There is in all this an entire absence of prodigality in the employment of miracles; they are ultimate resources, reserved for the great needs of God's kingdom, not its everyday incidents; they are not cheap off-hand expedients, which may always be appealed to, but come only into play when nothing else would have supplied their room. How unlike this moderation to the wasteful expenditure of miracles in the legends of the Middle Ages! There no perplexity can occur so trifling that a miracle will not be brought in to solve it; there almost no saint, certainly no distinguished one, is without his *nimbus* of miracles around his head; they are adorned with these in rivalry with one another, in rivalry with Christ Himself. That remarkable acknowledgment, 'John did no miracle' (John x. 41), finds no parallel in the records of their lives.

We must add to this the declarations of Scripture, which

I have already treated at large, on the object of miracles, that they are for the confirming the word by signs following, for authenticating a message as being from heaven—that signs are for the unbelieving (1 Cor. xiv. 22). What do they then in a Christendom? It may indeed be answered, that in it are unbelievers still; yet not in the sense in which St. Paul uses the word, for he means not the positively unbelieving, not those that in heart and will are estranged from the truth, but the negatively, and that, because the truth has never yet sufficiently accredited itself to them.[1] Signs are not for these last, the positively unbelieving, since, as we have seen, they will exercise no power over such as harden themselves against the truth; these will resist or evade them as surely as they will resist or evade every other witness of God's presence in the world;—but for the unbelieving who hitherto have been such by no fault of their own, for them to whom the truth is now coming for the first time. And if not always even for them now,—as they exist, for instance, in a heathen land,—we may sufficiently account for this by the fact that the Church of Christ, with its immense and evident superiorities of all kinds over everything with which it is brought in contact, and some portions of which superiority every man must recognize, is itself now the great witness and proof of the truth which it delivers. The truth, therefore, has no longer need to vindicate itself by an appeal to something else; but the position which it has won in the very forefront of the world is itself its vindication, and suffices to give it a first claim on every man's attention.

And then further, all that we might ourselves beforehand presume from the analogy of external things leads us to the same conclusions. We find all beginning to be wonderful—to be under laws different from, and higher than, those which regulate ulterior progress. Thus the

[1] The ἄπιστοι, not the ἀπειθεῖς.

powers evermore at work for the upholding of the natural world would have been manifestly insufficient for its first creation; there were other which must have presided at its birth, but which now, having done their work, have fallen back, and left it to follow the laws of its ordinary development. The multitudinous races of animals which people the earth, and of plants which clothe it, needed infinitely more for their first production than suffices for their present upholding. It is only according to the analogies of that which thus everywhere surrounds us, to presume that it was even so with the beginnings of the spiritual creation—the Christian Church. It is unquestionably so with the beginnings of that new creation in any single heart. Then, in the regeneration, the strongest tendencies of the old nature are overborne; the impossible has become possible, in some measure easy; by a mighty wonder-stroke of grace the polarity in the man is shifted; the flesh, that was the positive pole, has become the negative, and the spirit, which was before the negative, is henceforth the positive. Shall we count it strange, then, that the coming in of a new order, not into a single heart, but into the entire world—a new order bursting forcibly through the bonds and hindrances of the old, should have been wonderful? It would have been inexplicable if it had been otherwise. The son of Joseph might have lived and died, and done no miracles: but the Virgin-born, the Son of the Most Highest, Himself the middle point of all wonder,—for Him to have done none, herein, indeed, had been the mightiest and the most inexplicable marvel of all.

But this new order, having not only declared but constituted itself, having asserted that it is not of any inevitable necessity bound by the heavy laws of the old, henceforth submits itself in outward things, and for the present time, to those laws. All its true glory, which is its inward, it retains; but these powers, which are not the gift—for Christ Himself is the gift—but the signs of the gift, it

forgoes. 'Miracles,' says Fuller, 'are the swaddling clothes of the infant Churches;' and, we may add, not the garments of the full grown. They were as the proclamation that the king was mounting his throne; who, however, is not proclaimed every day, but only at his accession; when he sits acknowledged on his throne, the proclamation ceases. They were as the bright clouds which gather round, and announce the sun at his rising; his mid-day splendour, though as full, and indeed fuller, of light and heat, knows not those bright heralds and harbingers of his rising. Or they may be likened to the temporary framework on which the arch is rounded, a framework taken down as soon as that is completed. That the Church *has had* these wonders,—that its first birth was, like that of its divine Founder, wonderful,—of this it preserves a record and attestation in the Scriptures of truth. The miracles recorded there live for the Church; they are as much present witnesses for Christ to us now as to them who actually saw them with their eyes. For they were done once, that they might be believed always; that we, having in the Gospels the lively representation of our Lord portrayed for us, might as surely believe that He was the ruler of nature, the healer of the body, the Lord of life and of death, as though we had actually ourselves seen Him allay a storm, or heal a leper, or raise one dead.

Moreover, a very large proportion of the later miracles presented to our belief bear inward marks of spuriousness. The miracles of Scripture,—and among these, not so much the miracles of the Old Covenant as the miracles of Christ and his Apostles, being the miracles of that highest and latest dispensation under which we live,—we have a right to consider as normal, in their chief features at least, for all future miracles, if such were to continue in the Church. The details, the local colouring, might be different, and there would be no need to be perplexed at such a difference

appearing; yet the later must not, in their inner spirit, be totally unlike the earlier, or they will carry the sentence of condemnation on their front. They must not, for instance, lead us back under the bondage of the senses, while those other were ever framed to release from that bondage. They must not be aimless and objectless, fantastic freaks of power, while those had every one of them a meaning and distinct ethical aim,—were bridges by which Christ found access from men's bodies to their souls, —manifestations of his glory, that men might be drawn to the glory itself.[1] They must not be ludicrous and grotesque, saintly jests, while those were evermore reverent and solemn and awful. And lastly, they must not be seals and witnesses to aught which the conscience, enlightened by the Word and Spirit of God,—whereunto is the ultimate appeal, and which stands above the miracle, and not beneath it,—protests against as untrue (the innumerable Roman miracles which attest transubstantiation), or as error largely mingling with the truth (the miracles which go to uphold the whole Roman system), those other having set their seal only to the absolutely true. Miracles with these marks upon them we are bound by all which we hold most sacred, by all which the Word of God has taught us, to reject and to refuse. It is for the reader, tolerably acquainted with the Church-history of the Middle Ages, to judge how many of its miracles will, if these tests be acknowledged and applied, at once fall away, and, failing to fulfil these primary conditions, will have no right even to be considered any further.[2]

[1] On this subject there are some good remarks in an article, which can by no means be accepted as a whole, in the *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1844, pp. 679–708.

[2] The results are curious, which sometimes are come to through the following up to their first sources the biographies of eminent Roman saints. Tholuck has done this in regard of Ignatius Loyola and Francis Xavier; and to him (*Verm. Schrift.* pp. 50–57) I am mainly indebted for the materials of the following note.—Few, perhaps, have been surrounded with such a halo of wonders as the two great pillars of the

Very interesting is it to observe how the men who in some sort fell in with the prevailing tendencies of their age

order of the Jesuits, Loyola and Xavier. Upwards of two hundred miracles of Loyola were laid before the Pope, when his canonization was in question,—miracles beside which those of our Lord shrink into insignificance. If Christ by his word and look rebuked and expelled demons, Ignatius did the same by a letter. If Christ walked once upon the sea, Ignatius many times in the air. If Christ, by his countenance shining as the sun and his glistering garments, once amazed his disciples, Ignatius did it frequently, and, entering into dark chambers, could, by his presence, light them up as with candles. If sacred history records three persons whom Christ raised from the dead, the number which Xavier raised exceeds all count. In like manner the miracles of his great namesake of Assisi rivalled, when they did not leave behind, those of Christ. The author of the *Liber Conformitatum*, writing of him less than a century after his death, brings out these 'conformities' of the Master and the servant: Hic sicut Jesus aquam in vinum convertit, panes multiplicavit, et de naviculâ in medio fluctuum maris miraculose immotâ, per se a terrâ abductâ, docuit turbas audientes in littore. Huic omnis creatura quasi ad nutum videbatur parere, ac si in ipso esset status innocentiæ restitutus. Et ut cetera taceam: cæcos illuminavit; surdos, claudos, paralyticos, omnium infirmitatum generibus laborantes curavit, leprosos mundavit; dæmones effugavit; captivos eripuit; naufragis succurrit, et quam plures mortuos suscitavit (Gieseler, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, vol. ii. part II. p. 355). But to return to Ignatius, and the historic evidence of *his* miracles. Ribadeneira, from early youth his scholar and companion, published, fifteen years after his death, in 1572, a life of his departed master and friend; which book appeared again in 1587, augmented with much additional matter communicated by persons who, having lived in familiar intercourse with Ignatius, must have been well acquainted with all the facts of his life (gravissimi viri et Ignatio valde familiares). Notably enough, neither in the first, nor yet in the second so greatly enlarged edition, does the slightest trace of a miracle appear. So far from this, the biographer discusses at length the reasons why it did not please God that miracles should be wrought by this eminent servant of his: Sed dicat aliquis, si hæc vera sunt, ut profecto sunt, quid causæ est, quam ob rem illius sanctitas minus est testata miraculis, et, ut multorum Sanctorum vita, signis declarata, virtutumque operationibus insignita? Cui ego: Quis cognovit sensum Domini, aut quis conciliarius ejus fuit? Ille enim est qui facit mirabilia magna solus, propterea illius tantummodo infinitâ virtute fieri possunt, quæcumque aut naturæ vim aut modum excedunt. Et ut solus ille hæc potest efficere, ita ille solus novit, quo loco, quo tempore miracula et quorum precibus facienda sint. Sed tamen neque omnes sancti viri miraculis excelluerunt; neque qui illorum aut magnitudine præstiterunt, aut copiâ, idcirco reliquos sanctitate superarunt. Non enim sanctitas cujusque signis, sed caritate æstimanda est. Two years before the appearance of the second edition, in 1585, Maffei, styled the Jesuit Livy, published at Rome his work, *De Vitâ et Moribus S. Ignatii Loyolæ Libri tres*; and

(for, indeed, who escapes them?), yet did ever, in their higher moods, with truest Christian insight, witness against those very tendencies by which they, with the rest of their contemporaries, were more or less borne away. Thus was it with regard to the over-valuing of miracles, the esteeming of them as the only evidences of an exalted sanctity. Against this what an unbroken testimony in all ages of the Church was borne; not, indeed, sufficient to arrest the progress of an error into which the sense-bound generations of men only too naturally fall, yet witnessing that the Church herself was ever conscious that the holy life was in the sight of God of higher price than the wonderful works —that love is the greatest miracle of all—that to overcome the world, this is the greatest manifestation of the power of Christ in his servants.[1] Upon this subject one passage from Chrysostom, in place of the many that might be

neither in this is aught related of the great founder of the Order, which deserves the name of a miracle, although here are some nearer approaches to such than in the earlier biography—remarkable intimations, as of the death or recovery of friends, glimpses of their beatified state, ecstatic visions in which Christ appeared to him; but even these introduced in a half-apologetic tone, the historian evidently declining to pledge himself to their truth: Non pauca de eodem admirabilia *prædicantur*, quorum aliqua nobis hoc loco exponere visum est. But with miracles far more astounding and more numerous the Roman Church has surrounded Loyola's great disciple, Francis Xavier. Miracles were as his daily food; to raise the dead was as common as to heal the sick. Even the very boys who served him as catechists received and exercised a similar power of working wonders. Now there are, I believe, no historic documents whatever, of a contemporary date, which profess to vouch for these. We have further a series of letters written by this great apostle to the heathen, out of the midst of his work in the far East (*S. Francisci Xaverii Epistolarum Libri tres;* Pragæ, 1750); letters showing him to have been one of the discreetest, as he was one of the most fervent, preachers of Christ that ever lived, and full of admirable hints for the missionary; but of miracles wrought by himself, of miracles which the missionary may expect in aid of his work, there occurs not a single word.

[1] Thus compare Augustine's admirable treatment of the subject, *Enarr. in Ps.* cxxx., beginning with the words: Ergo sunt homines, quos delectat miraculum facere, et ab eis qui profecerunt in Ecclesiâ miraculum exigunt, et ipsi qui quasi profecisse sibi videntur, talia volunt facere, et putant se ad Deum non pertinere, si non fecerint.

quoted, and even that greatly abridged, must suffice.[1] He is rebuking the faithful, that now, when their numbers were so large, they did so little to leaven the world, and this, when the Apostles, who were but twelve, effected so much; and he puts aside the excuse, 'But they had miracles at command,' not with the answer, 'So have we;' but in this language: 'How long shall we use their miracles as a pretext for our sloth? "And what was in them," you say, "which made the Apostles so great?" I answer, This, that they contemned money; that they trampled on vain-glory; that they renounced the world. If they had not done thus, but had been slaves of their passions, though they had raised a thousand dead, they would not merely have profited nothing, but would have been counted as impostors. What miracle did John, who reformed so many cities, of whom yet it is expressly said, that he did no sign? And thou, if thou hadst thy choice, to raise the dead in the name of Christ, or thyself to die for his name, which wouldst thou choose? Would it not be plainly the latter? And yet that were a *miracle*, and this is but a *work*. And if one gave thee the choice of turning all grass into gold, or being able to despise all gold as grass, wouldst thou not choose the latter? And rightly; for by this thou wouldst most effectually draw men to the truth. This is not my doctrine, but the blessed Paul's: for when he had said, "Covet earnestly the best gifts," and then added, "yet show I unto you a more excellent way," he did not adduce miracles, but love, as the root of all good things.'[2]

[1] *Hom.* xlvi. *in Matth.*

[2] Compare a beautiful passage by St. Bernard, *Serm.* xlvi. 8, *in Cant.* Neander (*Kirch. Gesch.* vol. iv. pp. 255–257) quotes many like utterances coming from the chief teachers of the Church, even in the midst of the darkness of the ninth century. Thus Odo of Clugny relates of a pious layman, to whom some grudged his reputation for sanctity, seeing that he wrought no miracles, how that once detecting a thief in the act of robbing him, he not merely dismissed him, but gave him all that which he would wrongfully have taken away, and adds, Certe mihi videtur, quod

Few points present greater difficulties than the attempt to fix accurately the moment when these miraculous powers were withdrawn from the Church, and it entered into its permanent state, with only its present miracles of grace and the record of its past miracles of power; instead of actually possessing those miracles of power by whose aid it first asserted itself in the world. This is difficult, because it is difficult to say at what precise moment the Church was no longer in the act of *becoming*, but contemplated in the mind of God as actually *being*; when to the wisdom of God it appeared that He had adequately confirmed the word with signs following, and that this framework might be withdrawn from the completed arch, these props and strengthenings of the tender plant might safely be removed from the hardier tree.[1]

That their retrocession was gradual, that this mighty tide of power should have ebbed only by degrees,[2] this was

id magis admiratione dignum sit, quam si furem rigere in saxi duritiem fecisset. Neander (vol. v. pp. 477, 606) collects other medieval testimonies to the same effect.

[1] This image is Chrysostom's (*Hom.* xlii. *in Inscript. Act. Apostt.*): 'As therefore a husbandman, having lately committed a young tree to the bosom of the earth, counts it worthy, being yet tender, of much attention, on every side fencing it round, protecting it with stones and thorns, so that neither it may be torn by the winds, nor harmed by the cattle, nor injured by any other injury; but when he sees that it is fast rooted and has sprung up on high, he takes away the defences, since now the tree can defend itself from any such wrong; thus has it been in the matter of our faith. When it was newly planted, while it was yet tender, great attention was bestowed on it on every side. But after it was fixed and rooted and sprung up on high, after it had filled all the world, Christ both took away the defences, and for the time to come removed the other strengthenings. Wherefore at the beginning He gave gifts even to the unworthy, for the early time had need of these helps to faith. But now He gives them not even to the worthy, for the strength of faith no longer needs this assistance.' Compare Gregory the Great (*Hom.* xxix. *in Evang.*): Hæc [signa] necessaria in exordio Ecclesiæ fuerunt. Ut enim fides cresceret, miraculis fuerat nutrienda: quia et nos cum arbusta plantamus, tamdiu eis aquam infundimus, quousque ea in terrâ jam convaluisse videamus; et si semel radicem fixerint, in rigando cessamus.

[2] Thus Origen (*Con. Cels.* ii. 46) calls the surviving gifts in the Church *vestiges* (ἴχνη) of former powers; and again (ii. 8) he speaks of them as

what was to be looked for in that spiritual world which, like God's natural world, is free from all harsh and abrupt transitions, in which each line melts imperceptibly into the next. We can conceive the order of retrocession to have been in this way; that divine power which dwelt in all its fulness and intensity in Christ, was first divided among his Apostles, who, therefore, individually wrought fewer and smaller works than their Lord. It was again from them further subdivided among the ever-multiplying numbers of the Church, who, consequently, possessed not these gifts in the same intensity and plenitude as did the twelve. At the same time it must always be remembered that these receding gifts were ever helping to form that which should be their own substitute; that if they were waning, that which was to supply their room was ever waxing,—that they only waned as that other waxed; the flower dropped off only as the fruit was being formed. If those wonders of a first creation have left us, yet they did not this till they could bequeath in their stead the standing wonder of a Church,[1] itself a wonder, and embracing manifold wonders in its bosom.[2] For are not the laws of

ἴχνη καί τινά γε μείζονα. Compare ii. 3. 24; vii. 4. 67; Tertullian, *De Animâ*, 51; Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 9; Irenæus, ii. 32 and 33; v. 6; Justin Martyr, *Apol.* ii. 6. There is a curious passage in Abelard (*Sermo de Joan. Bapt.* p. 967), directed against the claimants to the power of working miracles in his day. Though he does not mention St. Bernard, one cannot doubt that Abelard has him in his eye.

[1] Augustine (*De Civ. Dei*, xxii. 8): Quisquis adhuc prodigia, uti credat, inquirit, magnum est ipse prodigium, qui mundo credente, non credat.

[2] Coleridge (*Literary Remains*, vol. iv. p. 260): 'The result of my own meditations is, that the evidence of the Gospel, taken as a total, is as great for the Christians of the nineteenth century as for those of the apostolic age. I should not be startled if I were told it was greater. But it does not follow that this equally holds good of each component part. An evidence of the most cogent clearness, unknown to the primitive Christians, may compensate for the evanescence of some evidence which they enjoyed. Evidences comparatively dim have waxed into noonday splendour, and the comparative wane of others once effulgent is more than indemnified by the *synopsis* τοῦ παντός which we enjoy, and by the standing miracle of a Christendom commensurate and almost synonymous with the civilized world.'

the spiritual world, as they are ever working in the midst of us, a continual wonder? What is the new birth in Baptism, and the communion of Christ's body and blood in the Holy Eucharist, and the life of God in the soul, and a kingdom of heaven in the world, what are these but every one of them wonders?[1] wonders in this like the wonders of ordinary nature, as distinguished from those which accompany a new in-coming of power, that they are under a law which we can anticipate; that they conform to an absolute order, and one the course of which we can understand;—but not therefore the less divine.[2] How

[1] The wonder of the existence and subsistence of a Church in the world is itself so great, that Augustine says strikingly, that to believe, or not to believe, the miracles is only an alternative of wonders. If you believe not the miracles, you must at least believe this miracle, that the world was converted without miracles (si miraculis non creditis, saltem huic miraculo credendum est, mundum sine miraculis fuisse conversum; cf. *De Civ. Dei*, xxii. 8, 1). And on the relation of the helps to faith, the witnesses of God's presence in the midst of his Church, which severally we have, and which the early Christians had, he says (*Serm.* ccxliv. 8): Apostoli Christum præsentem videbant: sed toto orbe terrarum diffusam Ecclesiam non videbant: videbant caput, et de corpore credebant. Habemus vices nostras: habemus gratiam dispensationis et distributionis nostræ: ad credendum certissimis documentis tempora nobis in una fide sunt distributa. Illi videbant caput, et credebant de corpore: nos videmus corpus, et credamus de capite. Augustine's own judgment respecting the continuance of miracles in the Church varied at different times of his life. In an early work, *De Verâ Religione*, xxv. 47, he denies their continuance: Cum enim Ecclesia Catholica per totum orbem diffusa atque fundata sit, nec miracula illa in nostrum tempus durare permissa sunt, ne animus semper visibilia quæreret; while in his *Retractations* (i. 13, 25) he withdraws this statement, or limits it to such miracles as those which accompanied baptism at the first; and *De Civ. Dei*, xxii. 8, he enumerates at great length miracles, chiefly or exclusively miracles of healing, which he believed to have been wrought in his own time, and coming more or less within his own knowledge. On this whole subject see Mozley, *Eight Lectures on Miracles*, pp. 210, 373, 383; and the art. *Geistesgaben* in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie*, vol. iv. p. 736.

[2] Gregory the Great (*Hom.* xxix. *in Evang.*): Sancta quippe Ecclesia quotidie spiritaliter facit quod tunc per Apostolos corporaliter faciebat. Nam sacerdotes ejus cum per exorcismi gratiam manum credentibus imponunt, et habitare malignos spiritus in eorum mente contradicunt, quid aliud faciunt, nisi dæmonia ejiciunt? Et fideles quique qui jam vitæ veteris secularia verba derelinquunt, sancta autem mysteria insonant, Conditoris sui laudes et potentiam, quantum prævalent, narrant, quid

meanly do we esteem of a Church, of its marvellous gifts, of the powers of the coming world which are working within it, of its Word, of its Sacraments, when it seems to us a small thing that in it men are new born, raised from the death of sin to the life of righteousness, the eyes of their understanding enlightened, and their ears opened, unless we can tell of more visible and sensuous wonders as well. It is as though the heavens should not declare to us the glory of God, nor the firmament show us his handiwork, except at some single moment such as that when the sun was standing still upon Gibeon, and the moon in Ajalon (Josh. x. 12, 13).

While then it does not greatly concern us to know *when* this power was withdrawn, what does vitally concern us is, that we suffer not these carnal desires after miracles, as

aliud faciunt, nisi novis linguis loquuntur? Qui dum bonis suis exhortationibus malitiam de alienis cordibus auferunt, serpentes tollunt. Et dum pestiferas suasiones audiunt, sed tamen ad operationem pravam minime pertrahuntur, mortiferum quidem est quod bibunt, sed non eis nocebit. Qui quoties proximos suos in opere bono infirmari conspiciunt, dum eis totâ virtute concurrunt, et exemplo suæ operationis illorum vitam roborant qui in propriâ actione titubant, quid aliud faciunt, nisi super ægros manus imponunt, ut bene habeant? Quæ nimirum miracula tanto majora sunt, quanto spiritalia, tanto majora sunt, quanto per hæc non corpora sed animæ suscitantur. . . . Corporalia illa miracula ostendunt aliquando sanctitatem, non autem faciunt: hæc vero spiritalia, quæ aguntur in mente, virtutem vitæ non ostendunt, sed faciunt. Illa habere et mali possunt: istis autem perfrui nisi boni non possunt. . . . Nolite ergo amare signa quæ possunt cum reprobis haberi communia, sed hæc quæ modo diximus, caritatis atque pietatis miracula amate: quæ tanto securiora sunt, quanto et occulta; et de quibus apud Dominum eo major fit retributio, quod apud homines minor est gloria. Compare Augustine, *Serm.* lxxxviii. 3; and Origen (*Con. Cels.* ii. 48) finds in these wonders of grace which are ever going forward, the fulfilment of the promise that those who believed should do greater things than Christ Himself (John xiv. 12). Bernard too, *In Ascen. Dom. Serm.* i., has some beautiful remarks on the better miracles, which are now evermore finding place in Christ's Church. For the literature upon this, and indeed upon every other part of the subject, see the admirable article on *Miracles* by the Bishop of Killaloe in the *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. ii. p. 283; and for all which can be urged in favour of some at least of the *Miracles recorded in the Ecclesiastical History of the Early Ages*, see Cardinal Newman's well-known *Essay* on this subject, which bears this name.

though they were certainly saints who had them, and they but imperfect Christians who were without them, as though the Church were inadequately furnished and spiritually impoverished which could not show them, to rise up in our hearts; being, as they are, ever ready to rise up in the natural heart of man, to which power is so much dearer than holiness. There is no surer proof than the utterance of sentiments such as these, that the true glory of the Church is hidden from our eyes—that some of its outward trappings and ornaments have caught our fancy; and not the fact that it is all-glorious within, answering to the deepest needs of the spirit of man, which has taken possession of our hearts and minds. It is little which we ourselves have known of the miracles of grace, when *they* seem to us poor and pale, when only the miracles of power have any attraction in our eyes.

CHAPTER V.

THE ASSAULTS ON THE MIRACLES.

1. The Jewish.

A RIGID monotheistic religion like the Jewish left but one way of escape from the authority of miracles which once were acknowledged to be such, and not set aside as mere collusions and sleights of hand. There remained nothing to say, but that which the adversaries of the Lord constantly *did* say, namely, that the works which He wrought were wrought by power from beneath: 'This fellow doth not cast out devils but by Beelzebub, the prince of the devils'[1] (Matt. xii. 24; cf. Mark iii. 22–27; Luke xi. 15–22). We have our Lord's own answer to the deep malignity of this assertion; his appeal, namely, to the whole tenor of his doctrine, and of the miracles wherewith He confirmed that doctrine—whether they were not altogether for the overthrowing of the kingdom of evil,—whether a lending by Satan of such power to Him would not be wholly inconceivable, being merely and altogether suicidal. For though it might be quite intelligible that Satan should bait his hook with *some* good, array himself as an angel of light, and do for a while deeds that might appear as deeds of light, so better to carry through some mighty delusion—

> 'Win men with honest trifles, to betray them
> In deepest consequence,'

[1] They regarded Him as planum in signis (Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* iii. 6; cf. *Apolog.* xxi.). This charge is dressed out with infinite blasphemous additions in the later Jewish books (see Eisenmenger, *Entdeckt. Judenth.* vol. i. p. 148, seq.; and an article by Rösch, *Die Jesusmythen des Judenthums,* in the *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1873, p. 89, sqq.).

just as Darius was willing that a small detachment of his army should perish, if so the mighty deceit which Zopyrus was practising against Babylon might succeed,[1]—yet the furthering upon his part of such an assault against his own kingdom as, if successful, must overturn it altogether, is quite inconceivable. That kingdom, thus in arms against itself, could not stand, but must have an end. He who came, as all his words and his deeds testified, to 'destroy the works of the devil,' could not have come armed with *his* power, and helped onward by his aid. It is not of a pact with the Evil One which this tells, but of Another mightier than that Evil One, who has entered with violence into his stronghold; and who, having bound him, is now spoiling his goods. Our Lord does in fact repel the accusation, and derives authority to his miracles, not from the power which they display, however that may be the first thing that brings them under observation, but from the ethical ends which they serve. He appeals to every man's conscience, whether the doctrine to which they bear witness, and which bears witness to them, be from above, or from beneath: and if from above, then the power with which He accomplished them could not have been lent Him from beneath, since the kingdom of lies would never so contradict itself, as seriously to help forward the establishment of the kingdom of truth.[2]

There is, indeed, at first sight a difficulty in the argument which our Saviour draws from the oneness of the kingdom of Satan—namely, that the very idea of this kingdom, as we present it to ourselves, is that of an anarchy, of blind rage and hate not merely against God, but every part of it warring against every other. And this is most deeply true, that hell is as much in arms against itself as against heaven; neither does our Lord deny that *in respect of itself* that kingdom is infinite anarchy, con-

[1] Herodotus, iii. 155.

[2] Eusebius (*Dem. Evang.* iii. 6) makes much of this argument.

tradiction, division, and hate: only He asserts that *in relation to the kingdom of heaven* it is at one: there is one life in it and one soul in opposition to that. Just as a nation or kingdom may embrace within itself infinite parties, divisions, discords, jealousies, and heart-burnings; yet, if it is to subsist as a nation at all, it must not, *as regards other nations*, have lost its sense of unity; when it does so, of necessity it falls to pieces and perishes. To the Pharisees He says: 'This kingdom of evil subsists; by your own confession it does so; it cannot therefore have denied the one condition of its existence, which is, that it should not lend its powers to the overthrowing of itself, that it should not side with its own foes; my words and works declare that I am such a foe; it cannot therefore be siding with Me.'

This accusation brought against the miracles of Christ, that they were done by the power of an evil magic, the heathen also sometimes used; but evidently having borrowed this weapon from the armoury of Jewish gainsayers.[1] And in their mouths, who had no such earnest idea of the kingdom of God upon one side and the kingdom of evil on the other, and of the fixed limits which divide the two, who had peopled the intermediate space with middle powers, some good, some evil, some mingled of both, the accusation was not at all so deeply malignant as in the mouth of a Jew. It was little more than a stone which

[1] See a curious passage, Origen, *Con. Cels.* i. 68; cf. i. 6; ii. 49; viii. 9; and compare Augustine, *De Cons. Evang.* i. 9–11; Jerome, *Brev. in Psal.* lxxxi. in fine; Arnobius, *Adv. Gen.* i. 43, who mentions this as one of the calumnies of the heathen against the Lord: Magus fuit, clandestinis artibus omnia illa perfecit: Ægyptiorum ex adytis angelorum potentium nomina et remotas furatus est disciplinas; cf. 53. This charge of fetching his magical skill from Egypt, which Celsus repeats (Origen, *Con. Cels.* i. 28, 38; cf. Eusebius, *Dem. Evang.* iii. 6), betrays at once the Jewish origin of the accusation, recurring evermore as it does in Jewish books. Egypt, say they, was the natural home of magic, so that if the magic of the world were divided into ten parts, Egypt would possess nine; and there, even as the Christian histories confess, Jesus resided two years (Eisenmenger, *Entdeckt. Judenth.* vol. i. pp. 149, 166).

they found conveniently at hand to fling, and with them is evermore passing over into the charge that those works were wrought by trick—that they were conjuror's arts; the line between the two charges is continually disappearing. The heathen, however, had a method more truly their own of evading the force of the Christian miracles, which is now to consider.

2. The Heathen. (Celsus, Hierocles, Porphyry.)

A religion like the Jewish, which, besides God and the Angels in direct and immediate subordination to Him, left no spirits conceivable but those in rebellion against Him, the absolutely and entirely evil, this, as has been observed already, left no choice, when once the miracle was adjudged not to be from God, save to ascribe it to Satan. There was nothing between; it was from heaven, or, if not from heaven, from hell. But it was otherwise in the heathen world, and with the 'gods many' of polytheism. So long as these lived in the minds and thoughts of men, the argument from the miracles was easily evaded. For what at the utmost did they prove in respect of their author? What but this, that *a* god, it might be one of the higher, or it might be one of the middle powers, the δαίμονες, the intermediate deities, was with him? What was there, men replied, in this circumstance, which justified the demand of an absolute obedience upon their parts? Wherefore should they yield exclusive allegiance to Him that wrought these works? The gods had spoken often by others also, had equipped them with powers equal to or greater than those claimed by his disciples for Jesus; yet no man therefore demanded for them that they should be recognized as absolute lords of the destinies of men. Æsculapius performed wonderful cures; Apollonius went about the world healing the sick, expelling demons, raising the dead;[1] Aristeas disappeared from the earth

[1] Lactantius, *Inst. Div.* v. 3.

in as marvellous a way as the founder of the Christian faith:[1] yet no man built upon these wonders a superstructure so immense as that which the Christians built upon the wonders of Christ.[2]

Thus Celsus, as we learn from more than one passage in Origen's reply, adduces now the mythic personages of antiquity, now the magicians of a later date; though apparently with no very distinct purpose in his mind, but only with the feeling that somehow or other he can play them off against the divine Author of our religion, and defeat his claims to an allegiance of men such as excluded every other. For it certainly remains a question how much credence he gave himself to the miracles which he adduced—Origen[3] charges him with not believing them—whether, sharing the almost universal scepticism of the educated classes of his day, it was not rather his meaning that all should fall, than that all should stand, together. Hierocles, governor of Bithynia, a chief instigator of the cruelties under Diocletian,—and who, if history does not belie him, wielded arms of unrighteousness on both hands against the Christian faith, the persecutor's sword and the libeller's pen,—followed in the same line.

[1] Origen, *Con. Cels.* iii. 27.

[2] The existence of false cycles of miracles should no more cast a suspicion upon all, or cause to doubt those which present themselves with marks of the true, than the appearance of a parhelion forerunning the sun should cause us to deny that he was travelling up from beneath the horizon, for which rather it is an evidence. The false money passes, not because there is none better, and therefore all have consented to receive it, but because there is a good money, under colour of which the false is accepted. Thus is it with the longing which has existed 'at all times and in all ages after some power which is not circumscribed by the rules of ordinary visible experience, but which is superior to these rules and can transgress them.' The mythic stories in which such longings find an apparently historic clothing and utterance, so far from being eyed with suspicion, should be most welcome to the Christian inquirer. The enemies of the faith will of course parade these shadows, in the hope of making us believe that our substance is a shadow too; but they are worse than simple who are cozened by so palpable a fraud.

[3] *Con. Cels.* iii. 22.

His book we know from the extracts in the answer of Eusebius, and the course of his principal arguments. Having recounted various miracles wrought, as he affirms, by Apollonius, he proceeds thus: 'Yet do we not account him who has done such things for a god, only for a man beloved of the gods: while the Christians, on the contrary, on the ground of a few insignificant wonder-works, proclaim their Jesus for a God.'[1] He presently, it is true, shifts his arguments, and no longer admits the miracles, only denying the conclusions drawn from them; but rather denies that they have any credible attestation: in his blind hate setting them in this respect beneath the miracles of Apollonius, which this 'lover of truth,' for he writes under the name of *Philalethes*, declares to be far more worthily attested.

This Apollonius (of Tyana in Cappadocia), whose historical existence there seems no reason to call in question, was probably born about the time of the birth of Christ, and lived as far as into the reign of Nerva, A.D. 97. Save two or three isolated notices of an earlier date, the only record which we have of him is a *Life*, written by Philostratus, a rhetorician of the second century, and professing to be founded on contemporary documents, yet everywhere betraying its unhistoric character. It is in fact a philosophic romance, in which the revival and reaction of paganism in the second century is portrayed. Yet I cannot think that *Life* to have been composed with any purpose directly hostile to the new faith, but only to prove that they of the old religion had their mighty thaumaturge as well. It was composed indeed, as seems to me perfectly clear, with an eye to the life of our Lord; the parallels are too remarkable to have been the results of

[1] In the same way Arnobius (*Adv. Gen.* i. 48) brings in the heathen adversary saying it is idle to make these claims (frustra tantum arrogas Christo) on the score of the miracles, when so many others have done the like.

chance;[1] in a certain sense also in emulation and rivalry; yet not in hostile opposition, not as implying this was the Saviour of men, and not that; nor yet, as some of Lucian's works, in a mocking irony of the things which are written concerning the Lord.[2] This later use which has often been made of the book, must not be confounded with its original purpose, which was different. The first, I believe, who *so* used it, was Charles Blount,[3] one of the earlier English Deists. And passing over some other insignificant endeavours to make the book tell against revealed religion, endeavours in which the feeble hand, however inspired by hate, yet wanted strength and skill to launch the dart, we come to Wieland's *Agathodæmon*, in which neither malice nor dexterity was wanting, and which, professing to explain upon natural grounds the miracles of Apollonius, yet unquestionably points throughout at one greater than the wonder-worker of Tyana, with a hardly suppressed *de te fabula narratur* running through the whole.[4]

[1] See, for instance, upon the raising of the widow's son, the parallel miracle which I have adduced from the life of Apollonius. The above is Baur's conclusion in his instructive little treatise, *Apollonius von Tyana und Christus*, Tübingen, 1832.

[2] His *Philopseudes*, for instance, and his *Vera Historia*. Thus I can assent only to the latter half of Huet's judgment (*Dem. Evang.* prop. ix. 147): Id spectâsse imprimis videtur Philostratus, ut invalescentem jam Christi fidem ac doctrinam deprimeret, opposito hoc omnis doctrinæ, sanctitatis, ac mirificæ virtutis fœneo simulacro. Itaque ad Christi exemplar hanc expressit effigiem, et pleraque ex Christi Jesu historiâ Apollonio accommodavit, ne quid ethnici Christianis invidere possent.

[3] In his now scarce translation, with notes, of *The two first books of Philostratus*, London, 1680, with this significant motto from Seneca, Cum omnia in incerto sint, fave tibi, et crede quod mavis. Compare *Apollonius of Tyana, the Pagan Christ of the Third Century*, by Albert Réville, English Translation, London, 1866.

[4] The work of Philostratus has been used with exactly an opposite aim by Christian apologists, namely, to bring out, by comparison with the best which heathenism could offer, the surpassing glory of Christ. Cudworth, in his *Intellectual System*, iv. 15, occupies himself at a considerable length with Apollonius. Here may probably have been the motive to Blount's book, which followed only two years after the publication of Cudworth's great work. Henry More, too (*Mystery of God-*

The arguments drawn from these parallels, so far as they were adduced in good faith and in earnest, have, of course, perished with the perishing of polytheism from the minds of men. Other miracles can no longer be played off against Christ's miracles; the choice which remains now is between these and none.

3. The Pantheistic. (Spinoza.)

These two classes of assailants of the Scripture miracles, the Jewish and the heathen, allowed the miracles themselves to stand unquestioned as facts, but either challenged the source from which they came; or denied the consequences drawn from them by the Church. Not so the pantheistic deniers of the miracles, who assailed them not as being of the devil, not as insufficient proofs of Christ's claims of absolute lordship; but cut at their very root, denying that any miracle was possible, since it was contrary to the idea of God. For these opponents of the truth Spinoza may be said, in modern times, to bear the word; the objection is so connected with his name, that it will be well to hear it as he has uttered it. That objection is indeed only the necessary consequence of his philosophical system. Now the first temptation on making acquaintance with that system is to contemplate it as a mere and sheer atheism; and such has ever been the ordinary charge against it; nor, in studying his works, is it always easy to persuade oneself that it is anything else, or that the various passages in which Spinoza himself assumes it as something different, are more than inconsequent statements, with which he seeks to blind the eyes of others, and to avert the odium of this charge of atheism from himself. And yet atheism it is not, nor is it even a *material*, however it may be a *formal*, pan-

liness, iv. 9–12), compares at large the miracles of Christ with those of Apollonius.

theism. He does not,—and all justice requires that this should be acknowledged,—bring down and resolve God into nature, but rather takes up and loses nature in God. It is only man whom he submits to a blind fate, and for whom he changes, as indeed for man he does, all ethics into physics. But the idea of freedom, as regards God, is saved; since, however he affirms Him immanent in nature and not transcending it, this is only because He has Himself chosen these laws of nature as the one unchangeable manner of his working, and constituted them in his wisdom so elastic, that they shall prove, under all circumstances and in every need, the *adequate* organs and servants of his will. He is not bound to nature otherwise than by that, his own will; the laws which limit Him are of his own imposing; the necessity which binds Him to them is not the necessity of any absolute fate, but of the highest fitness. Still, however, Spinoza does affirm such a necessity. The *natura naturans* must unfold itself in the *natura naturata*, and thus excludes the possibility of any revelation, whereof the very essence is that it is a new beginning, a new unfolding by God of Himself to man, and especially excludes the miracle, which is itself at once the accompaniment, and itself a constituent part, of a revelation.

Let me here observe, that to deny that miracles can find a *fitting* place in God's moral and spiritual government of the world is one thing; to deny that they can find a *possible* place, that there is any room for them there, is another. It may be indeed a question whether the latter has not sometimes been intended when the former only was pretended. Still the denial of their fitness, where honestly meant, and where nothing else is lurking behind, involves no necessary assault on the essential attributes of God. With the denial of the *possibility* of miracles it is otherwise. In this denial there is in fact a withdrawal from Him of all which constitutes Him more than the animating principle of the world. He is no longer a God

of freedom, a living God, above nature and independent of nature; but nature is the necessary form of his existence, and condition of his manifestation. Shut up and confined within limits which He is impotent to overpass, in this strait-waistcoat of nature, He is less favoured than some of the meanest of his creatures. If the snail is tied to its house, it can at worst move up and down with this house whither it will; if the silk-worm is closely enveloped in the cerements of its cocoon, it at all events has the prospect of bursting as a butterfly from these. But there is no such liberty, no such hope of liberty, for a God who is enclosed within the limits of nature, and of nature as we know it now, and who can only manifest Himself through this.[1]

It would profit little to enter in detail on the especial charges which Spinoza brings against the miracle, as lowering, and unworthy of, the idea of God. They are but the application to a particular point of the same charges which he brings against all revelation, namely, that to conceive any such is to dishonour, and cast a slight upon, God's great original revelation of Himself in nature and in man; a charging of that with such imperfection and incompleteness, as that it needed the author of the world's laws to interfere in aid of those laws, lest they should prove utterly inadequate to his purposes.[2] With the miracle in

[1] In that half-recantation which Henry Heine made at the last of all the proud things that he had spoken against God, and which, most imperfect though it be, none can read without the deepest interest, these remarkable words occur; he is tracing the steps of his return to God,—may it indeed have been a return to Him!—and says: 'On my way I found the god of the Pantheists, but I could make nothing of him. This poor visionary creature is interwoven with and grown into the world. Indeed he is almost imprisoned in it, and yawns at you, without voice, without power. To have will, one must have personality, and to manifest oneself, one must have elbow-room.'

[2] *Tract. Theol. Pol.* vi.: Nam cum virtus et potentia naturæ sit ipsa Dei virtus et potentia, leges autem et regulæ naturæ ipsa Dei decreta, omnino credendum est, potentiam naturæ infinitam esse, ejusque leges adeo latas, ut ad omnia quæ et ab ipso divino intellectu concipiuntur, se

particular he finds fault, as a bringing in of disorder into that creation, of which the only idea worthy of God is that of an unchangeable order. It is a making of God to contradict Himself, for the law which was violated by the miracle is as much God's law as the miracle which violated it. The answer to this objection has been already anticipated: the miracle is not a discord in nature, but the coming in of a higher harmony; not disorder, but instead of the order of earth, the order of heaven; not the violation of law, but that which continually, even in this natural world, is taking place, the comprehension of a lower law in a higher; in this case the comprehension of a lower natural, in a higher spiritual law; with only such orderly violence done to the lower as is necessarily consequent upon this.[1]

When, further, he imputes to the miracle that it rests on a false assumption of the position which man occupies in the universe, flatters the notion that nature is to serve him, not he to bow to nature, it cannot be denied that it does rest on this assumption. But this were only a charge which would tell *against* it, supposing that true, which so far from being truth, is indeed his first great falsehood of all, namely, that God is first a God *of nature*, and only a God *of men* as they find their place in the order of nature. If God be indeed only or chiefly the God of nature, and not in a paramount sense the God of grace, the God of men, if nature be indeed the highest, and man only created as furniture for this planet, it would be indeed absurd and inconceivable that the higher should serve, or give place

extendant; alias enim quid aliud statuitur, quam quod Deus naturam adeo impotentem creaverit, ejusque leges et regulas adeo steriles statuerit, ut sæpe de novo ei subvenire cogatur, si eam conservatam vult, et ut res ex voto succedant? quod sane à ratione alienissimum esse existimo.

[1] Emerson adopts Spinoza's aspect of a miracle when he says, 'The word miracle, as pronounced by Christian Churches, gives a false impression. It is a monster; it is not one with the blowing clouds and the falling rain.'

to, the lower. But if, rather, man is 'the crown of things,' the end and object of all, if he be indeed the vicegerent of the Highest, the image of God, the first-fruits of his creatures, this world and all that belongs to it being but a school for the training of men, only having a worth and meaning when contemplated as such, then that the lower should serve, and, where need is, give way to the interests of the highest, were only beforehand to be expected.[1]

Here, as is so often the case, something much behind the miracle, something much earlier in men's view of the relations between God and his creatures, has already determined whether they should accept or reject it, and this, long before they have arrived at the consideration of this specific matter.

4. The Sceptical. (Hume.)

While Spinoza rested his objection to the miracles on the ground that the everlasting laws of the universe left no room for such, while, therefore, the form which the question in debate assumed in his hands was this, Are miracles (objectively) *possible*? Hume, the legitimate child and pupil of the empiric philosophy of Locke, started his objection in altogether a different shape, namely, in this, Are miracles (subjectively) *credible*? He is, in fact, the sceptic, which,—taking the word in its more accurate sense, not as a *denier* of the truths of Christianity, but a *doubter* of the possibility of arriving at any absolute truth,—Spinoza is as far as possible from being. To this question Hume's answer is in the negative; or rather, in the true spirit of that philosophy which leaves everything in uncertainty, 'It is always more probable that a miracle is false than true; it can therefore in no case prove anything else,

[1] They are the truly wise, he says (*Tract. Theol. Pol.* vi.), who aim not at this, ut natura iis, sed contra ut ipsi naturæ pareant, utpote qui certe sciunt, Deum naturam dirigere prout ejus leges universales, non autem prout humanæ naturæ particulares leges exigunt, adeoque Deum non solius humani generis, sed totius naturæ rationem habere.

since it is itself incapable of proof;'—which thus he proceeds to show. In every case, he observes, of conflicting evidence, we weigh the evidence for and against the alleged facts, and give our faith to that side upon which the evidence preponderates, with an amount of confidence proportioned, not to the whole amount of evidence in its favour, but to the balance which remains after subtracting the evidence against it. Thus, if the evidence on the side of A might be set as = 20, and that on the side of B as = 15, then our faith in A would remain 20 − 15 = 5; we giving our faith upon the side on which a balance of probabilities remains, and only to the extent of that balance. But every miracle, he goes on to say, *is* a case of conflicting evidence. In its favour is the evidence of the attesting witnesses; against it the testimony of all experience which has gone before, and which witnesses for an unbroken order of nature. When we come to balance these against one another, the only case in which the evidence for the miracle could be admitted as prevailing would be that *in which the falseness or error of the attesting witnesses would be a greater miracle than the miracle which they affirm.* But no such case can occur. The evidence against a miracle having taken place is as complete as can be conceived. Even were the evidence in its favour as complete, it would only be proof against proof, and absolute suspension of judgment would be the wise man's part. But the evidence in favour of the miracle never makes claim to any such completeness. It is always more likely that the attesting witnesses were deceived, or were willing to deceive, than that the miracle took place. For, however many they may be, they must always be few compared with the multitudes who attest a fact which excludes their fact, namely, the uninterrupted succession of a natural order in the world; and those few, moreover, submitted to divers warping influences, from which the others, nature's witnesses, are altogether free. Therefore there is no case in

which the evidence for any one miracle is able to outweigh the *à priori* evidence which is against all miracles. Such is the conclusion at which Hume arrives. The argument, it will be seen, is sceptical throughout. Hume does not, like Spinoza, absolutely deny the possibility of a miracle; all he denies is that we can ever be convinced of one. Of two propositions or assertions that *may be* true which has the least evidence to support it; but according to the necessary constitution of our mental being, we must give our adherence to that which presents itself to us with the largest amount of evidence in its favour.

Here again, as on a former occasion, so long as we abide in the region of nature, miraculous and improbable, miraculous and incredible, may be admitted as convertible terms. But once lift up the whole discussion into a higher region, once acknowledge something higher than nature, a kingdom of God, and men the intended denizens of it, and the whole argument loses its strength and the force of its conclusions. Against the argument from experience which tells against the miracle, is to be set, not, as Hume asserts, the evidence of the witnesses, which it is quite true can in no case itself be complete and of itself sufficient, but this, *plus* the anterior probability that God, calling men to live above nature and sense, would in this manner reveal Himself as the Lord paramount of nature, the breaker through and slighter of the apparitions of sense; *plus* also the testimony which the particular miracle by its nature, its fitness, the glory of its circumstances, its intimate coherence as a redemptive act with the personality of the doer, in Coleridge's words, 'its exact accordance with the ideal of a true miracle in the reason,' gives to the conscience that it is a divine work. The *moral* probabilities Hume has altogether overlooked and left out of account, and when they are admitted,—dynamic in the midst of his merely mechanic forces,—they disturb and indeed utterly overbear and destroy them. His argument is as that

fabled giant, unconquerable so long as it is permitted to rest upon the earth out of which it sprang; but easily destroyed when once it is lifted into a higher world. It is not, as Hume would fain have us to believe, solely an intellectual question; but it is in fact the moral condition of men which will ultimately determine whether they will believe the Scripture miracles or not; this, and not the exact balance of argument on the one side or the other, which will cause this scale or that to kick the beam.

He who already counts it likely that God will interfere for the higher welfare of men, who believes that there is a nobler world-order than that in which we live and move, and that it would be the blessing of blessings for that nobler to intrude into and to make itself felt in the region of this lower, who has found that here in this world we are bound by heavy laws of nature, of sin, of death, which no powers that we now possess can break, yet which must be broken if we are truly to live,—he will not find it hard to believe the two crowning miracles, the coming of the Son of God in the flesh, and his declaration as the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead; because all the deepest desires and longings of his heart have yearned after such a deliverer, however little he may have been able even to dream of so glorious a fulfilment of those longings. And as he believes the mightiest miracles of all, so will he believe all other miracles, which, as satellites of a lesser brightness, naturally wait upon these, clustering round and drawing their lustre from the central brightness of those greatest. He, upon the other hand, to whom this world is all, who has lost all sense of a higher world with which it must once have stood intimately connected, who is disturbed with no longings for anything nobler than it gives, to whom 'the kingdom of God' is an unintelligible phrase, he will resist, by an intellectual theory if he can, or if not by that, by instinct, the miracle. Everything that is in him predisposes him to disbelieve it and the doctrines

which it seals. To him who denies thus any *final* causes, who does not believe that humanity is being carried forward under a mightier leading than its own to a certain and that a glorious end, who looks at the history of this world and of man as that of a bark tempest-tost long, with no haven to which it is bound, to him these moral probabilities are no probabilities; and this being so, we should learn betimes how futile it is to argue with men about *our* faith, who are the deniers of all upon which *any* faith can be built.[1]

5. The Miracles only relatively miraculous. (Schleiermacher.)

Another scheme for getting rid of the miraculous element in the miracle, one often united with Spinoza's *à priori* argument against it,[2] and brought forward to explain the phenomenon of an apparent miracle, after that has shown that a real one was impossible, has been this. These works, it is said, were *relative* miracles,—miracles, in other words, for those in regard of whom they were first done,—as when a savage believes that a telescope has the power of bringing the far off instantaneously near,—but no miracles in themselves, being but in fact the anticipation of discoveries in the kingdom of nature, the works of one who, having penetrated deeper into her mysteries than

[1] Augustine (*De Util. Cred.* xvi.): Si enim Dei providentia non præsidet rebus humanis, nihil est de religione satagendum. See some valuable remarks on Hume and on his position in Mill's *Logic*, vol. ii. p. 187, 2nd edit. It is not wonderful that the author of *Supernatural Religion*, 1874 (the title, let me say, is calculated to deceive), should do his best, his readers will judge with what success, to do away with the impression which these observations of Mill, certainly not written from the orthodox point of view, nor in the interests of supernatural religion, must make upon every candid reader.

[2] As by Spinoza himself, *Ep.* xxiii.: Rogare mihi liceat an nos homunciones tantam naturæ cognitionem habeamus, ut determinare possimus, quousque ejus vis et potentia se extendit, et quid ejus vim superat?

those around him, could therefore wield powers which were unknown, and bring about results which were inexplicable, to them.[1] It must be evident to the least thoughtful, that, however it may be sought to disguise the fact, the miracle does thus become no miracle,[2] and the doer of it can no longer be recognized as commanding nature in a way specifically different from other men, but only as one who has a clearer or earlier insight than others into her laws and the springs of her power. We have indeed here nothing else but a decently veiled denial of the miracle altogether.[3] For thus it has no longer an eternal significance. The circle of these wondrous works is no longer a halo which shall surround the head of him who wrought them for ever. With each enlargement of

[1] Thus Hase (*Leben Jesu*, p. 108): Sie sind zwar nothwendig begriffen im Naturzusammenhange, daher nach diesem überall zu forschen ist, aber sie überschritten weit die Kenntniss und Kraft der Zeitgenossen. Reinhard: Miraculum est mutatio a *manifestis* naturæ legibus abhorrens, cujus *a nobis* nulla potest e viribus naturalibus ratio reddi. Bonnet (*Recherches Philosoph. sur les Preuves du Christianisme*, Geneva. 1769) had already anticipated this definition of the miracle: while Renan in these last times has put it with epigrammatic neatness: Le miracle n'est que l'inexpliqué.

[2] Mirabile, but not miraculum. Augustine's definition in one place (*De Util. Cred.* xvi.), Miraculum voco quicquid arduum aut insolitum supra spem vel facultatem mirantis apparet, is plainly faulty; it is the definition of the mirabile, not of the miraculum. Aquinas is more distinct (*Summ. Theol.* 1, qu. 110, art. 4): Non sufficit ad rationem miraculi, si aliquid fiat præter ordinem alicujus naturæ particularis, sic enim aliquis miraculum faceret lapidem sursum projiciendo; ex hoc autem aliquid dicitur miraculum, quod fit præter ordinem totius naturæ creatæ, quo sensu solus Deus facit miracula. Nobis enim non omnis virtus naturæ creatæ nota; cum ergo fit aliquid præter ordinem naturæ creatæ nobis notæ per virtutem creatam nobis ignotam, est quidem miraculum quoad nos, sed non simpliciter.

[3] J. Müller (*De Mirac J. C. Nat. et Necess.* par. ii. p. 1) well characterizes this scheme: Quid vero? num de miraculorum necessitate ordiamur a notione miraculi tollendâ? Si enim ex eâ sententiâ mirabilia Christi opera e propriis naturæ viribus secundum hujus legem, at absconditam, orta sunt, certum et constans discrimen hæc inter et illa quæ quodidie in naturâ fieri videmus, remanet nullum; omnia fluunt et miscentur; quæ rerum natura heri gremio suo operuit, aperit hodie; quæ etiam nunc abscondita sunt, posthac patebunt. Si vero, quod hodie miraculum, cras non erit, et hodie non *est*, sed *esse* tantum *videtur*.

men's knowledge of nature a star in his crown of glory is extinguished, till at length it fades altogether into the light of common day, nay, rather declares that it was never more than a deceitful and meteor fire at the best. For it implies a serious moral charge against the doer of these works, if he vents them as wonders, as acts of a higher power than nature's, or allows others so to receive them, when indeed he entirely knows that they are wrought in accordance with her ordinary laws. It might pass, according to the spirit in which he was working, for one of the early conquerors of the New World to make the Indians, whom he wished to terrify, believe that in his displeasure with them he would at a certain hour darken the moon, when indeed he did but foreknow an eclipse of her orb: [1] but in the kingdom of truth to use artifices like these would be little else but by lies to seek to overturn the kingdom of lies.

Schleiermacher [2] endeavours so to guard this view as that it shall not appear an entire denial of the miracles, to dress it out and prevent its nakedness from appearing; but he does not, in fact, lift himself above it. Christ, he says, had not merely this deeper acquaintance with nature than any other that ever lived, but stands in a more inward connexion with nature. He is able to evoke, as from her hidden recesses and her most inward sanctuary, powers which none other could; although still powers which lay in her already. These facts, which seem exceptional, were deeply laid in the first constitution of the law; and now, at the turning-point of the world's history, by the providence of God, who had arranged all things from the beginning for the glory of his Son, did at his bidding

[1] Plutarch (*De Def. Orac.* 12) mentions exactly the same trick of a Thessalian sorceress. A late writer upon the rule of the Jesuits in Paraguay accuses them of using artifices of the like kind for acquiring and maintaining an influence over their converts.

[2] *Der Christl. Glaube*, vol. i. p. 100; vol. ii. p. 135.

emerge. Yet, single and without analogy as these 'wonders of preformation' (for so one has called them) were, they belonged to the law as truly as when the aloe flowers, or is said to flower, once in a hundred years, it does this according to the law of its being. For ninety and nine years it would have seemed to men not to be the nature of the plant to flower, yet the flowering of the hundredth year is only the unfolding of a germ latent, so to say, in the heart of the plant from the beginning.

We see in this scheme that attempt to reconcile and atone between revelation and science, which was a main purpose of all Schleiermacher's writings. Yet is it impossible to accept the reconciliation which he offers; as it is really made, however skilfully the sacrifice may be concealed, altogether at the expense of the miracle [1]—which, in fact, is no miracle, if it lay in nature already, if it was only the evoking of forces latent therein, not a new thing, not the bringing in of the novel powers of a higher world; if the mysterious processes and powers by which those works were brought about, had been only undiscovered hitherto, and not undiscoverable, by the efforts of human inquiry.[2]

Augustine has been sometimes quoted, but altogether unjustly, as favouring this scheme of the relatively miraculous.[3] It is quite true that, when arguing with the heathen, he does demand why they refuse to give credence to the Scripture miracles, when they believe so much that

[1] Schleiermacher indeed himself, in some letters of his in the *Theol. Studien und Kritiken*, 1838, confesses as much, and does not shrink from this conclusion: 'If they [the miracles] be really regarded as matters of fact, we must grant that so far as they have been produced *in nature*, analogies to them must be also found in nature; and thus the old idea of a miracle must be given up.'

[2] See Köstlin, *De Miraculorum Naturâ et Ratione*, 1860, p. 6.

[3] The same has been sometimes ascribed to Bishop Butler on the strength of a passage in his *Analogy*, pt. 1, c. 2; in which, however, the understanding reader will at once recognize that he has quite another purpose in view; see Mozley, *Eight Lectures on Miracles*, p. 156.

is inexplicable by any laws which their experience supplied; that he instances some real, some also entirely fabulous, phenomena of the natural world, such as fountains cold by night and hot by day,—others which extinguished a lighted torch, but set on fire an extinguished one,—stones which, once kindled, could not be quenched,—magnets which attracted iron, and other wonders, to which he and they gave credence alike.[1] But it is not herein his meaning to draw down the miracles to a level with natural appearances, hitherto unexplained, but capable of and waiting their explanation. Rather in these natural appearances he sees direct interpositions of the Divine Power; he does not reckon that any added knowledge will bring them under laws of human experience, and therefore he lifts them up to a level with the miracles. He did not merge the miracles in nature, but drew up a portion of nature into the region of the miraculous. However greatly as a natural philosopher he may have been here at fault, yet all extenuating of the miracle was far from him; indeed he ever refers it to the omnipotence of God as to its ultimate ground.[2]

When he affirms that much *seems* to be against nature, but nothing truly is, this may sound at first like the same statement of the miraculous being such merely in relation to certain persons and certain stages of our knowledge of this material world. But it is only in sound that it is similar. He has quite a different thought of nature from any that will admit such to be his meaning. Nature is for him but the outward expression of the will of God; and all which he affirms is, that God never can be contrary to God; that there can be no conflict and collision of his wills; that whatever comes in is as true an order, the result of as real a law, as that which gives place to it; which must needs be, since it has come in according

[1] *De Civ. Dei*, xxi. 5. [2] *Ibid.* xxi. 7.

to the will of God, which will is itself the highest order, and law, and harmony.[1]

6. The Rationalistic. (Paulus.)

The rise of rationalism,—which term I use for convenience sake, and without at all consenting to its fitness, for it is as absurd a misnomer as when in the last century that was called *free*-thinking, which was assuredly to end in the slavery of all thought,—seems to have been in this manner. It may be looked at as an escape from the conclusions of mere Deists concerning Christ's Person and his Word, upon the part of some, who had indeed abandoned the true faith of the Church concerning its Head, yet were not prepared to give up the last lingering vestiges of their respect for Holy Scripture and for Him of whom Scripture testified. They with whom this system grew up could no longer believe the miracles, they could no longer believe the great miracle in which all other are included, a Son of God in the Church's sense of the term. They, too, were obliged to fall in with the first principles of the infidel adversary, that any who professed to accomplish miracles was either deceiver or self-deceived, even as those who related such as having happened must be regarded as standing in the same dilemma. But what if it could be shown that Christ never professed to do any miracles, nor the sacred historians to record any? if it could be shown that the sacred narratives, rightly read, gave no countenance to any such assumption, and that it was only the lovers of, and cravers after, the marvellous, who had found any miracles there;—the books themselves having been intended to record merely

[1] See the quotation from Augustine, p. 12. That he had perfectly seized the essential property of a miracle, and distinguished it broadly from the relatively miraculous, is plain from innumerable passages. Thus (*De Civ. Dei*, x. 16): Miracula, . . . *non ea dico* quæ intervallis temporum occultis ipsius mundi caussis, verumtamen sub divinâ providentiâ constitutis et ordinatis monstrosa contingunt, quales sunt inusitati partus animalium, et cælo terrâque rerum insolita facies.

natural events? Were not this an escape from the whole difficulty? The *divine*, it is true, in these narratives would disappear; that, however, they did not desire to save; that they had already given up: but the *human* would be vindicated; the good faith, the honesty, the entire credibility of the Scripture historians, would remain unimpeached. And in Christ Himself there would be still that to which they could look up with reverence and love; they could still believe in Him as the truthful founder of a religion which they shrank from the thought of renouncing altogether. No longer being, as the Church declared Him, the worker of wonders, clothed with power from on high, nor professing to be that which He was not, as the blasphemers affirmed, He would still abide for them, the highest pattern of goodness which the world hitherto had seen, as He went up and down the world, healing and blessing, though with only the same means of help at his command as were possessed by other men.

Their attempt was certainly a bold one. To suffer the sacred text to stand, and yet to find no miracles in it, did appear a hopeless task. For this, it must be always remembered, altogether distinguishes this system from later mythic theories, that it *does* accept the New Testament as historic throughout; it does appeal to the word of Scripture as the ground and proof of its assertions; its great assertion being that the Evangelists did not intend to relate miracles, but ordinary facts of everyday experience, works done by Jesus, now of friendship and humanity, now of medical skill, now, it might be, of chance and good fortune, or other actions which from one cause or other seemed to them of sufficient significance to be worth recording. Thus Christ, they said, did not heal an impotent man at Bethesda, but only detected an impostor; He did not change water into wine at Cana, but brought in a new supply of wine when that of the house was exhausted; He did not multiply the loaves, but, distributing his own

and his disciples' little store, set an example of liberality, which was quickly followed by others who had like stores, and thus there was sufficient for all; He did not cure blindness otherwise than any skilful oculist might do it;—which indeed, they observe, is clear; for with his own lips He declared that He needed light for so delicate an operation—'I must work the works of Him that sent Me, while it is day; the night cometh, when no man can work' (John ix. 4); He did not walk on the sea, but on the shore; He did not tell Peter to find a stater in the fish's mouth, but to catch as many fish as would sell for that money; He did not cleanse a leper, but pronounced him cleansed; He did not raise Lazarus from the dead, but guessed from the description of his disease that he was only in a swoon, and happily found it as He had guessed.

This scheme, which many had already tried here and there, but which first appeared full blown and consistently carried through in the *Commentary* of Dr. Paulus, published in 1800, did not long survive in its first vigour. It perished under blows which reached it from many and these the most different quarters; for, not to speak of a reviving faith in the hearts of many, that God could do more than man could understand, even children of this present world directed against it the keenest shafts of their ridicule. Every scholar, nay, every man who believed that language had any laws, was its natural enemy, for it stood only by the violation of all these laws. Even the very advance of unbelief was fatal to it, for in it there was a slight lingering respect to the Word of God; moved by which respect, it sought forcibly to bring that Word into harmony with its theory, as a better alternative than the renouncing of the authority of that Word altogether. But when men arose who did not shrink from the other alternative, who had no desire to hold by that Word at all, then there was nothing to hinder them from at once coming back to the common-sense view of the subject,

one which no art could long succeed in concealing, namely that the Evangelists did at any rate *intend* to record supernatural events. Those to whom the Scriptures were *no* authority were, thus far at least, more likely to interpret them aright, in that they were not under the temptation to twist and pervert them, so to bring them into apparent agreement with their own systems.

This scheme of interpretation, thus assailed from so many sides, and itself merely artificial, did not long hold its ground. And now, even in the land of its birth, it has entirely perished; on the one side a deeper faith, on the other a more rampant unbelief, have encroached on, and in the end wholly swallowed up, the territory which for a while it sought to occupy as its own. This is indeed so little the form in which an assault on Revelation will ever clothe itself again, and may be so entirely regarded as one of the cast-off garments of unbelief, now despised and trodden under foot even of those who once glorified themselves in it, that I have not alluded, save very slightly and passingly, to it in the body of my book. Once or twice I have noticed its curiosities of interpretation, its substitutions, as they have been happily termed, of *philological* for *historical* wonders. The reader who is curious to see how Dr. Paulus and his compeers arrived at the desired result of exhausting the narrative of its miraculous element, will find specimens in my notes on *The miraculous feeding of five thousand*, and *The stater in the fish's mouth.*

7. The Historico-Critical. (Woolston, Strauss.)

The latest assault upon the miracles may not unfitly be termed the historico-critical. It declares that the records of them are so full of contradictions, psychological and other improbabilities, discrepancies between the account of one Evangelist and another, that upon close handling

they crumble to pieces, and are unable to maintain their ground as history. Among the English Deists of the last century, Woolston especially addressed himself in this way to the undermining the historic credit of these narratives. He was brought to this evil work in a singular way, and abides a mournful example of the extremes to which spite and mortified vanity may carry a weak man, though, as all testimonies concur in acknowledging, at one time of estimable conversation, and favourably known for his temperate life, his charity to the poor, and other external evidences of an inward piety. Born in 1669, and educated at Cambridge, where he became a Fellow of Sidney, he first attracted unfavourable notice by a certain crack-brained enthusiasm for the allegorical interpretation of Scripture, which he carried to all lengths. Whether he owed this bias to the works of Philo and Origen, or only strengthened and nourished an already existing predilection by the study of their writings, is not exactly clear; but it became a sort of 'fixed idea' in his mind. At first, although just offence was taken at more than one publication of his, in which his allegorical system was carried out at the expense apparently of the historic truth of the Scripture, yet, as it was not considered that he meant any mischief, as it was not likely that he would exert any wide influence, he was suffered to follow in his own line, unvisited by any serious censures from the higher authorities of the Church. Meeting, however, with opposition in many quarters, and unable to carry the clergy with him, he broke out at last in unmeasured invectives against them, and in a virulent pamphlet[1] styled them 'slaves of the letter,' 'Baal-priests,' 'blind leaders of the blind,' and the like, and was on account of this pamphlet deprived of his fellowship (1721).

[1] In his *Letter to the Rev. Dr. Bennett upon this question, Whether the Quakers do not the nearest of any other sect resemble the primitive Christians in principle and practices.* By Aristobulus, London, 1720.

From this time it seemed as if an absolute fury possessed him. Not merely the Church, but Christianity itself, was the object of his attack. Whether his allegorical system of interpretation had indeed ended, as it was very likely to end, in depriving him of all faith in God's Word, and he professed to retain his veneration for its spiritual meaning, only that he might, under shelter of that, more securely advance to the assault of its historical foundations, or whether he did still retain this in truth, it was at any rate only subordinate now to his purposes of revenge. To these he was ready to offer up every other consideration. When, then, in that great controversy which was raging in the early part of the last century, the defenders of revealed religion entrenched themselves behind the miracles, as defences from which they could never be driven, as irrefragable proofs of the divine origin of Christianity, Woolston undertook, by the engines of his allegorical interpretation, to dislodge them from these also, and with this view published his notorious *Letters on the Miracles.*[1]

[1] These six *Letters*, first published as separate pamphlets between 1727–29, had a vast circulation, and were read with the greatest avidity. Voltaire, who was in England just at the time of their appearance, says that thirty thousand copies were sold, and that large packets were forwarded to the American colonies. In the copy I am using, the different letters range from the third to the sixth edition, and this almost immediately after their first publication. Swift, in his lines on his own death, written 1731, quite consents with Voltaire's account of the immense popularity which they enjoyed; and makes Lintot, the bookseller, say,—

> 'Here's Woolston's tracts, the *twelfth* edition,
> 'Tis read by every politician:
> The country members when in town
> To all their boroughs send them down:
> You never met a thing so smart;
> The courtiers have them all by heart;' &c.

Their circulation was so great, and their mischief so wide, that above sixty answers were published within a very short period. Gibson, then Bishop of London, addressed five pastoral letters to his diocese against them; and other chief divines of England, as Sherlock, Pearce, Smallbrooke, found it expedient to answer them. Of the replies which I have seen, Smallbrooke's (Bishop of St. David's) *Vindication of our Saviour's Miracles*, 1729, is the most learned and the best. But one cannot help

It is his manner in these to take certain miracles which Christ did, or which were wrought in relation to Him, two or three in a letter; he then seeks to show that, understood in their literal sense, they are stuffed so full with extravagances, contradictions, absurdities, that no reasonable man can suppose Christ actually to have wrought them; while as little could the Evangelists, as honest men, men who had the credit of their Lord at heart, have intended to record them as actually wrought, or desired us to receive them as other than allegories, spiritual truths clothed in the garb of historic events. The enormous difference between himself and those early Church writers, to whom he appeals, and whose views he professes to be only re-asserting,—a difference of which it is impossible that he could have been ignorant,—is this: they said, This history, being real, has also a deeper ideal sense; he upon the contrary, Since it is impossible that this history can be real, therefore it must have a spiritual significance. They build upon the establishment of the historic sense, he upon its ruins.[1]

When he desires to utter grosser blasphemies than in his own person he dares, or than would befit the position

being painfully struck upon this and other occasions with the poverty and feebleness of the anti-deistical literature of England in that day of trial; the low grounds which it occupies; the little enthusiasm which the cause awakens in its defenders. The paltry shifts with which Woolston sought to evade the consequences of his blasphemy,—and there is an infinite meanness in the way in which he professes, while assailing the works of Christ, to be only assailing them in the letter that he may vindicate them in the spirit,—failed to protect him from the pains and penalties of the law. He was fined twenty-five pounds for each of his *Letters*, sentenced to be imprisoned for a year, and was not to be released till he could find sureties for his good behaviour. These he was unable to procure, and died in prison in 1731.

[1] Their canon was ever this of Gregory the Great (*Hom.* xl. *in Evang.*): Tunc namque allegoriæ fructus suaviter carpitur, cum prius per historiam in veritatis radice solidatur; and they abound in such earnest warnings as this of Augustine's: Ante omnia tamen, fratres, hoc in nomine Dei admonemus, ut quando auditis exponi Sacras Scripturas narrantes quæ gesta sunt, prius illud quod lectum est credatis sic gestum quomodo lectum est, ne subtracto fundamento rei gestæ, quasi in aëre quæratis ædificare. Compare what he says on the history of Jonah, *Ep.* cii. qu. vi. 33.

which he has assumed from whence to assault Revelation, he introduces a Jewish Rabbi, and suffers him to speak without restraint, himself standing by and observing, 'This is what an adversary might say; to these accusations we Christians expose ourselves, so long as we cleave to the historic letter; we only can evade their force by forsaking that, and holding fast the allegorical meaning alone.' I shall not (as it is not needful) offend the Christian reader by the reproduction of any of his coarser ribaldry, which has sufficient cleverness to have proved mischievous enough; but will show by a single example the manner in which he seeks to detect weak points in the Scripture narratives. He is dealing with the miracle of the man sick of the palsy, who was let through the broken roof of the house where Jesus was, and thereupon healed (Mark ii. 1–12). But how, he demands, should there have been such a crowd to hear Jesus preach at Capernaum, where He was so well known, and so little admired? And then, if there was that crowd, what need of such urgent haste? it was but waiting an hour or two, and the multitude would have dispersed; 'I should have thought their faith might have worked patience.' Why did not Jesus tell the people to make way? would they not have done so readily, since a miracle was the very thing they wanted to see? How should the pulleys, ropes, and ladder have been at hand to haul the sick man up? How strange that they should have had hatchets and other tools ready to hand, to break through the spars and rafters of the roof; and stranger still, that the good man of the house should have endured, without a remonstrance, his property to be so injured! How did those below escape without hurt from the falling tiles and plaster? And if there was a door in the roof, as some, to mitigate the difficulty, tell us, why did not Jesus go up to the roof, and there speak the healing word, and so spare all this trouble and damage and danger?

But enough;—it is evident that this style of objection could be infinitely multiplied. There is always in every story something else that might have happened besides the thing that did happen. It is after this taking to pieces of the narrative, this triumphant showing, as he affirms, that it cannot stand in the letter, that Woolston proceeds, as a sort of salve, to say it may very well stand in its spirit, as an allegory and symbol of something else; and that so, and so only, it was intended. Thus what he offers by way of this higher meaning in the present case is as follows: By this poor man's palsy is signified 'a dissoluteness of morals and unsteadiness of faith and principles, which is the condition of mankind at present, who want Jesus' help for the cure of it.' The four bearers are the four Evangelists, 'on whose faith and doctrine mankind is to be carried unto Christ.' The house to the top of which he is to be carried is 'the intellectual edifice of the world, otherwise called Wisdom's house.' But 'to the sublime sense of the Scriptures, called the top of the house, is man to be taken; he is not to abide in the low and literal sense of them.' Then if he dare to 'open the house of wisdom, he will presently be admitted to the presence and knowledge of Jesus.'[1]

[1] *Fourth Discourse on the Miracles*, pp. 51–67. Strauss's own judgment of his predecessor in this line very much agrees with that given above. He says: 'Woolston's whole presentation of the case veers between these alternatives. If we are determined to hold fast the miracles as actual history, then they forfeit all divine character, and sink down into unworthy tricks and common frauds. Do we refuse, on the other hand, to let go the divine in these narratives, then must we, with the sacrifice of their historic character, understand them only as the setting forth, in historic guise, of certain spiritual truths; for which, indeed, the authority of the chiefest allegorists in the Church, as Origen and Augustine and others, may be adduced;—yet so, that Woolston imputes falsely to them the intention of thrusting out, as he would do, the literal interpretation by the allegorical altogether; when indeed they, a few instances on Origen's part being excepted, are inclined to let both explanations stand, the one beside the other. Woolston's statement of the case may leave a doubt to which of the two alternatives that he sets over against one another, he with his own judgment inclines. If one

Not very different is Strauss's own method of proceeding. He wields the same weapons of destructive criticism, thinking to show how each history will crumble at his touch, resolve into a heap of improbabilities, which no one can any longer have the face to maintain. It needs not to say that he is a more accomplished adversary than Woolston, with far ampler resources at command,—more, if not of his own, yet of other men's learning; inheriting as he does all the negative criticism of the last hundred years, of an epoch, that is, which has been sufficiently fruitful in this kind. Here indeed is in great part the secret of the vast sensation which his work for a season produced. All that was scattered up and down in many books he has brought together and gathered into a single focus. What other men had spoken faintly and with reserve, he has spoken out; has been bold to give utterance to all which was trembling upon the lips of numbers, but which, from one cause or another, they had shrunk from openly avowing. At the same time in the treatment of the miracles,—for with that only we have now to do,—there are differences between him and Woolston. He unites in his own person the philosophical and the critical assailant of these. He starts from the philosophic ground of Spinoza, that the miracle is impossible, since the laws of nature are the only and the necessary laws of God and of his manifestation; the strait waistcoat from which He cannot escape; and he then proceeds to the critical

calls to mind, that before he came forward as an opponent of Christianity as received in his day, he occupied himself with allegorical interpretations of the Scripture, one might regard this as the opinion which was most truly his own. But, on the other hand, all that he can adduce of incongruities in the literal sense of the miracle histories is brought forward with such one-sided zeal, and so affects the whole with its mocking tone, that one must rather conjecture that the Deist seeks only, by urging the allegorical sense, to secure his own rear, that so he may the more boldly let himself loose on the literal meaning' (*Leben Jesu*, 3rd edit. vol. i. p. 14). There is a very accurate and carefully written account of Woolston, and his life and writings, in Lechler, *Geschichte des Englischen Deismus*, pp. 289–311.

examination of the evangelical miracles in detail; but of course in each case to the trial of that which has been already implicitly tried and condemned. Thus, if he is ever at a loss, if any of the miracles give him trouble, if they oppose a too stubborn resistance to the powerful solvents which he applies, threatening to maintain their ground in despite of all, he immediately falls back on his philosophic ground, and exclaims, 'But if we admit it was thus, then we should have here a miracle; and we have started from this as our first principle, namely, that such is inconceivable.' This mockery in every case he repeats, trying, one by one in particular, those which have all been condemned by him beforehand in the gross.

There is, too, this further difference, that while Woolston professed to consider the miracles as the conscious clothing of spiritual truth, allegories devised artificially, and, so to speak, in cold blood, for the setting forth of the truths of the kingdom, Strauss gives them a freer birth and a somewhat nobler origin. They are the halo of glory with which the infant Church gradually and without any purposes of fraud clothed its Founder and Head. His mighty personality, of which it was livingly conscious, caused it ever to surround Him with new attributes of glory. All that men had ever craved and longed for—deliverance from physical evil, dominion over the hostile powers of nature, victory over death itself,—all that had ever in a more restricted measure been attributed to any other,—they lent in larger abundance, in unrestrained fulness, to Him whom they felt greater than all. The Church in fact made or evolved its Christ, and not Christ his Church.[1]

With one only observation I will pass on, not detaining the reader any longer from more pleasant and more profitable portions of the subject. It is this,—that here, as

[1] See the very remarkable chapter, anticipating so much of modern speculation on this subject, in Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, xxii. 6.

so often, we find the longings and cravings of men after a redemption, in the widest sense of that word, made to throw suspicion upon Him in whom these longings and cravings are affirmed to have been satisfied. But if we believe a divine life stirring at the root of our humanity, the depth and universality of such longings is a proof rather that they were meant some day to find their satisfaction, and not always to be mere hopes and dreams; and if so, in whom, but in Him whom we preach and believe—in whom, but in Christ? What other beside Him could, with the slightest show of reason, be put forward as a fulfiller of the world's hopes, the realizer of the world's dreams? If we do *not* believe in this divine life, nor in a divine leading of our race, if we hold a mere brutal theory about man, it were then better altogether to leave discussing miracles and Gospels, which indeed have no meaning for us, as they can stand in no relation to us.

CHAPTER VI.

THE APOLOGETIC WORTH OF THE MIRACLES.

ALMOST interesting question remains: What place in the marshalling and presenting the evidences of Revelation should be allotted to the miracles? what service can they render here? The circumstances have been already noticed which hindered them from taking a very prominent place in the early apologies for the faith.[1] The Christian miracles had not as yet sufficiently extricated themselves from the multitude of false miracles, nor was Christ sufficiently discerned and distinguished from the various wonder-workers of his own and of past ages; and thus, even if men had admitted his miracles to be true and godlike, they would have been hardly nearer to the acknowledging of Christianity as the one faith, or to the accepting of Christ as 'the way, the truth, and the life.'

A far more prominent position has been assigned them in later times, especially during the last two centuries;

[1] Thus, in the *Apologies* of Justin Martyr, they are scarcely made use of at all. It is otherwise indeed with Arnobius, who (*Adv. Gen.* i. 42) lays much stress on them. Speaking of the truth of Christianity and of Christ's mission, he says, Nulla major est comprobatio quam gestarum ab eo fides rerum, quam virtutum,—and then appeals through ten eloquent chapters to his miracles. Augustine too is strong on their apologetic worth: thus in his *Confessions*: Introitus ad fidem sunt miracula, et infidelium causâ maxime fiunt. In modern times there are few, if any, to whom more is owing for a thoughtful discussion of the subjects dealt with in these chapters than Canon Mozley; see his *Bampton Lectures on the Miracles*, and, dealing more exclusively with this subject, his posthumous *Lectures and Theological Papers*, published in 1883.

and the tone and temper of modern theology abundantly explains the greater, sometimes the undue, because the exclusive, prominence, which in this period they have assumed. The apologetic literature of this time partook, as was inevitable, in the general depression of all its theology. Few would be satisfied now with the tone and spirit in which the defences of the faith, written during the last two centuries, and beginning with the memorable work of Grotius, *On the Truth of the Christian Religion*, are composed. Much as this book and others of the same character contain of admirable, yet in well nigh all that great truth of the poet seems to have been forgotten,

> 'They struggle vainly to preserve a part,
> Who have not courage to contend for all.'

These apologists seem very often to have acted as though Deism would best be resisted by reducing Christianity to a sort of revealed Deism. As men that had renounced the hope of defending all, their whole endeavour was to save something; and when their pursuers pressed them hard, they were willing to delay the pursuit by casting to these much that should have been far dearer to them than to be sacrificed thus. They have been well compared to men who cried 'Thieves and robbers!' while all the time they were themselves throwing out of the windows some of the most precious treasures of the house. And thus it sometimes happened that the good cause suffered quite as much from its defenders as its assailants; for that enemies should be fierce and bitter, this was only to be looked for; but that friends, those in whose keeping was the citadel, should be timid and half-hearted and ready for a compromise, if not for a surrender, was indeed an augury of ill. Now this, which caused so much to be thrust greatly out of sight, as generally the deeper mysteries of our faith, which brought about a slight of the inner arguments for the truth of Revelation, caused the argument from the miracles to assume a disproportionate

importance. A value too exclusive was set on them; they were rent away from the truths for which they witnessed, and which witnessed for them,—only too much like seals torn off from the document which at once *they* rendered valid, and which in return gave importance to them. And thus, in this unnatural isolation, separated from Christ's person and doctrine, the whole burden of proof was laid on them. *They* were the apology for Christianity, the reason men should give for the faith which was in them.[1]

It is not hard to see the motives which led to this. Men wanted an *absolute* demonstration of the Christian faith,—one which, objectively, should be equally good for every man: they desired to bring the matter to the same sort of proof as exists for a problem in mathematics or a proposition in logic. And consistently with this we see the whole argument cast exactly into the same forms of definitions, postulates, axioms, and propositions.[2] Yet the state of mind which made men so anxious to find for themselves, or to furnish for others, proofs of this nature, was not altogether a healthy one. It was plain that *their* faith had become very much an external historic one, who thus eagerly looked round for outward evidences, and found a value only in such; instead of turning in upon themselves as well, for evidence that they had 'not followed cunningly devised fables,' and saying, 'We *know* the things

[1] I include, in the proofs drawn from the miracles, those drawn from the O. T. prophecies,—for it was only *as miracles* (miracula præscientiæ, as the others are miracula potentiæ) that these prophecies were made to do service and arrayed in the forefront of this battle; as by the learned and acute Huet, in his *Demonstratio Evangelica*, in which the fulfilment of prophecy in the person of Jesus of Nazareth is altogether the point round which the whole argument turns, as he himself in the *Preface*, § 2, declares.

[2] For example, by Huet in his work referred to above. He claims for the way of proof upon which he is entering that it is the safest, and has the precision, and carries the conviction, of a geometrical proof (*Præfatio*, § 2): Utpote quæ constet hoc genere demonstrationis, quod non minus certum sit quam demonstratio quævis geometrica.

which we believe—they are to us truer than aught else can be, for we have the witness of the Spirit for their truth. We have proved these things to be true, for they have come to us in demonstration of the Spirit and in power.' In place of such an appeal to those mighty influences which Christ's words and works exercise on every heart that receives them, to their transforming, transfiguring power, to the miracles of grace which are the heritage of every one who has believed to salvation, instead of urging on the gainsayers in the very language of the Lord, 'If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God' (John vii. 17), this all as vague and mystical (instead of being seen to be, as it truly was, the most sure and certain of all) was thrown into the background. Men were afraid to trust themselves and their cause to evidences like these, and would know of no other statement of the case than this barren and hungry one:—Christianity is a divine revelation, and this the miracles which accompanied its first promulgation prove.

What we first find fault with here is the wilful abandonment of such large regions of proof, which the Christian Apologist ought triumphantly to have occupied as his own—the whole region, mainly and chiefly, of the inner spiritual life; the foregoing of any appeal to the mysterious powers of regeneration and renewal, which are ever found to follow upon a true affiance on Him who is the Giver of this faith, and who has pledged Himself to these very results in those who rightly receive it.

To these proofs he might at least have ventured an appeal, when seeking not to convince an unbeliever, but, as would be often his aim, to carry one that already believed round the whole circle of the defences of his position, to make him aware of the relative strength of each, to give him a scientific insight into the grounds on which his faith rested. Here, at any rate, the appeal to what he had himself known and tasted of the powers of the world

to come, might well have found room. For, to use the words of Coleridge,[1] 'Is not a true, efficient conviction of a moral truth, is not *the creating of a new heart*, which collects the energies of a man's whole being in the focus of the conscience, the one essential miracle, the same and of the same evidence to the ignorant and to the learned, which no superior skill can counterfeit, human or demoniacal; is it not emphatically that leading of the Father, without which no man can come to Christ; is it not that implication of doctrine in the miracle, and of miracle in the doctrine, which is the bridge of communication between the senses and the soul;—that predisposing warmth which renders the understanding susceptible of the specific impressions from the history, and from all other outward seals of testimony?' And even were the argument with one who had never submitted himself to these blessed powers, and to whose experience therefore no like appeal could be made, yet even for him there is the outward utterance of this inward truth, in that which he could not deny, save as he denied or was ignorant of everything, which would make him one to be argued with at all,—the standing miracle, I mean, of a Christendom 'commensurate and almost synonymous with the civilized world,'—the mighty changes which this religion of Christ has wrought in the earth,—the divine fruits which it everywhere has borne,—the new creation which it has everywhere brought about,—the manner in which it has taken its place in the world, not as a forcible intruder, but finding all that world's prëestablished harmonies ready to greet and welcome it, to give it play and room,—philosophy, and art, and science practically confessing that only under it could they attain their highest perfection, that in something they had all been dwarfed and stunted and incomplete till it came. Little as it wears of the glory which it ought, yet it wears enough to proclaim that its origin has been more than mundane.

[1] *The Friend*, vol. iii. Essay ii.

Surely from a Christendom, even such as it shows itself now, it is fair to argue back to a Christ such as the Church receives, as the only adequate cause. It is an oak which from no other acorn could have unfolded itself into so tall and stately a tree.

It is true that in this there is an abandoning of the attempt to put the proof of Christianity into the same form as that of a proposition in an exact science. There is no more the claim made of giving to it that kind of certainty. But this, which may seem at first sight a loss, is indeed a gain; for the argument for all which as Christians we believe, is in very truth not logical and single, but moral and cumulative; and the endeavour to substitute a formal proof, where the deepest necessities of the soul demand a moral, is one of the most grievous shocks which the moral sense can receive, as it is also a most fruitful source of unbelief. Few in whose hands books of Evidences constructed on this scheme have fallen, but must painfully remember the shock which they suffered from their acquaintance with these—how it took them, it may be, no little time to recover the healthy tone of their minds, and the confidence of their faith; and how, only by falling back upon what they themselves had felt and known of the living power of Christ's words and doctrine in their own hearts, could they escape from the injurious influences, the seeds of doubt and misgiving, which these books had now, for the first time perhaps, sown in their minds. They must remember how they asked themselves, in deep inner trouble of soul: 'Are these indeed the grounds, and the only grounds, the sole foundations on which the whole superstructure of my spiritual life reposes? Is this all that I have to answer? Are these, and no more, the reasons of the faith that is in me?' And then, if at any moment there arose a suspicion that some link in this chain of outward proof was wanting, or was too weak to bear all the weight which was laid upon it,—and men will be con-

tinually tempted to try the strength of that to which they have trusted all,—there was nothing to fall back upon, with which to scatter and put to flight suspicions and misgivings such as these. And that such should arise, at least in many minds, is inevitable; for how many points, as we have seen, are there at which a suspicion may intrude. Is a miracle possible? Is a miracle provable? Were the witnesses of these miracles competent? Did they not too lightly admit a supernatural cause, when there were adequate natural ones which they failed to note? These works may have been good for the eye-witnesses, but what are they for me? Does a miracle, admitting it to be a real one, authenticate the teaching of him who has wrought it? And these doubts and questionings might be multiplied without number. Happy the man, and he only happy, who, if the outworks of his faith are at any time thus assailed, can betake himself to an impregnable inner citadel, from whence in due time to issue forth and repossess even those exterior defences, who can fall back on those inner grounds of belief, in which there can be no mistake, the testimony of the Spirit, which is above and better than all.[1]

And as it is thus with him, who sincerely desiring to believe, is only unwillingly disturbed with doubts and suggestions, which he would give worlds to be rid of for ever, so not less the expectation that by arguments thrown into strict syllogistic forms there is any compelling to the faith one who does not wish to believe, is absurd, and an expectation which all experience contradicts. All that he is, and all that he is determined to be, has pledged him to an opposite conclusion. Rather than believe that a miracle has taken place, a miracle from the upper world, and connected with precepts of holiness, to which precepts he is resolved to yield no obedience, he will take refuge in any

[1] See the admirable words of Calvin, *Instit.* i. 7, §§ 4, 5, on the Holy Scripture as ultimately *αὐτόπιστος*, its own proof.

the most monstrous supposition of fraud, or ignorance, or folly, or collusion. If no such solution presents itself, he will wait for such, rather than accept the miracle, with the hated adjunct of the truth which it confirms. In what different ways the same miracle of Christ wrought upon different spectators! He raised a man from the dead; here was the same outward fact for all; but how diverse the effects!—some believed, and some went and told the Pharisees (John xi. 45, 46). Heavenly voices were heard,—and some said it thundered, so dull and inarticulate had those sounds become to them, while others knew that they were voices wherein was the witness of the Father to his own Son (John xii. 28–30).

Are then, it may be asked, the miracles to occupy no place at all in the array of proofs for the certainty of the things which we have believed? So far from this, a most important place. Our loss would be irreparable, if they were absent from our sacred history, if we could not point to them there. It is not too much to say that this absence would be fatal. There are indeed two miracles, that of the Incarnation and that of the Resurrection, round which the whole scheme of redemption revolves, and without which it would cease to be a redemptive scheme at all. But we are speaking here not of miracles whereof Christ was the subject, but of those which He wrought; and of them too we affirm that they belong to the very idea of a Redeemer, which would remain altogether incomplete without them. They are not, what Lessing would have them, a part of the scaffolding of Revelation; which, as such a scaffolding, yielded a temporary service; but which, now that the building is finished and stands complete without them, retain no further significance; and cannot be considered binding on any man's faith. They are rather a constitutive element of the revelation of God in Christ. We could not conceive of Him as not doing such works; and those

to whom we presented Him as Lord and Saviour might very well answer, 'Strange, that One should come to deliver all other men from the bondage of nature which was crushing them, and should yet Himself have been subject to its heaviest laws,—Himself "Wonderful" (Isai. ix. 6), and yet his appearance accompanied by no corresponding wonders in nature,—claiming to be the Life, and yet Himself helpless in the encounter with death; however much He may have promised in word, never realizing any part of his promises in deed; giving nothing in hand, no first-fruits of power, no pledges of greater things to come.' They would have a right to ask, 'Why did He give no signs that He came to connect the visible with the invisible world? why did He nothing to break the yoke of custom and experience, nothing to show men that the constitution which He professed to reveal has a true foundation?'[1] And who would not own that they had reason here, that a Saviour who so bore Himself during his earthly life, and his actual daily encounter with evil, would bring into most serious question his right to a Saviour's name? that He must needs show Himself, if He were to meet the wants of men, mighty not only in word but in work? that claiming more than a man's authority He should display more than a man's power?[2]

[1] Maurice, *The Kingdom of Christ*, vol. ii. p. 264. Compare Delitzsch (*Apologetik*, 1869, p. 9): Die Erlösung hört auf zu sein was sie biblischem Begriffe nach ist, wenn sie nicht, sowohl objectiv als aneignungsweise, sich als übernatürliche schöpferische Setzung eines neuen Anfangs innerhalb der alten Welt der Sünde und des Todes, also als wunderbare Durchbrechung der natürlichen Entwickelung, erweist. Nimmt man also das Wunder aus dem Christenthum hinweg, so fällt das ganze Gebäude zusammen, und es bleibt nichts übrig als eine durch Sage, Mythus und dogmatische Ueberspannung entstellte und, wenn auf ihren wahren Thatbestand zurückgebracht, mit natürlichen Mitteln zu begreifende culturgeschichtliche Erscheinung innerhalb des mit der Grundrichtung auf das Religiöse ausgestatteten semitischen Völkerstammes.

[2] It was the fatal weakness of Mahomet, and from many utterances of his it is plain that he constantly felt it to be such, that he could show no miracles with which to attest his mission as divine. It is true

When we find fault with the use often made of these works, it is only because they have been forcibly severed from the whole complex of Christ's life and doctrine, and presented to the contemplation of men apart from these; because, while on his head are 'many crowns' (Rev. xix. 12), one only has been singled out in proof that He is King of kings and Lord of lords. The miracles have been spoken of as though they borrowed nothing from the truths which they confirmed, but those truths everything from the miracles by which they were confirmed; when, indeed, the true relation is one of mutual interdependence, the miracles proving the doctrines, and the doctrines approving the miracles,[1] and both held together for us in a blessed unity, in the person of Him who spake the words and did the works, and through the impress of highest holiness and of absolute truth and goodness, which that person leaves stamped on our souls;—so that it may be more truly said that we believe the miracles for Christ's sake, than Christ for the miracles' sake.[2] Neither when we thus affirm that the miracles prove the doctrine, and the doctrine the miracles, are we arguing in a circle: rather we are receiving the sum total of the impression which this divine revelation is intended to make on us, instead of taking an impression only partial and one-sided.

that in a measure he won acceptance for himself and for his teaching without them; but he did this by throwing the sword, where Christ had thrown the cross, into the scale.

[1] See Pascal, *Pensées, 27, Sur les Miracles.*

[2] Augustine was indeed affirming the same, when, against the Donatists, and their claims to be accepted as the true Church on the ground of the miracles which they wrought, he replies (*De Unit. Eccles.* 16): Quæcunque talia in Catholicâ [Ecclesiâ] fiunt, ideo sunt approbanda, quia in Catholicâ fiunt; non ideo manifestatur Catholica, quia hæc in eâ fiunt.

THE MIRACLES.

1. *THE CHANGING OF THE WATER INTO WINE.*

JOHN ii. 1–11.

'*THIS beginning of miracles*' is as truly an introduction to all other miracles which Christ wrought, as the parable of the Sower to all other parables which He spoke (Mark iv. 13). No other miracle has so much of prophecy in it; no other, therefore, would have inaugurated so fitly the whole future work of the Son of God. For that work might be characterized throughout as an ennobling of the common, and a transmuting of the mean; a turning of the water of earth into the wine of heaven. But it will be better not to anticipate remarks, which will find their fitter place when the miracle itself shall have been considered.

'*And the third day there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee*'—on the third day, no doubt, after that on which Philip and Nathanael (i. 43) had attached themselves to Him. He and his newly-won disciples, of whom one was a native of Cana (see xxi. 2), would have journeyed without difficulty from the banks of Jordan to Cana[1] in two

[1] Among the happiest of Robinson's slighter rectifications of the geography of Palestine (*Biblical Researches*, vol. iii. pp. 204–208), although one which is still by some called in doubt (thus by Hengstenberg, and see the *Dict. of the Bible*, s. v. Cana), is his reinstatement of the true Cana in honours long usurped by another village. In the neighbourhood of Nazareth are two villages, one Kefr Kenna, about an hour and a half

days, and might so have been present at the '*marriage*,' or marriage festival, upon the third day after. '*And the mother of Jesus was there.*' The absolute silence of Scripture leaves hardly a doubt that Joseph was dead before Christ's open ministry began. He is last expressly mentioned on occasion of the Lord's visit as a child to the Temple (Luke ii. 41); which, however, he must for a certain period have overlived (ver. 51). '*And both Jesus was called, and his disciples, to the marriage.*' These, invited with their Master, and, no doubt, mainly to do honour to their Master, 'shadows' or '*umbræ*' all of them, whereof He was the substance, are probably not the Twelve, but those five only whose calling has just before been recorded, Andrew and Peter, Philip and Nathanael (Bartholomew?), and the fifth, probably the Evangelist himself; who will thus have been an eye-witness of the miracle which he records.[1] Him, as was seen long ago, we may with

N.E. from Nazareth; the other, Kâna el-Jelîl, about three hours' distance, and nearly due north. The former is now always pointed out to travellers as the Cana of our history, though the name can only with difficulty be twisted to the same, the 'Kefr' having first to be dropped altogether, and in Kenna, the first radical changed, and the second left out; while 'Kâna el-Jelîl' is word for word the 'Cana of Galilee' of Scripture, which exactly so stands in the Arabic version of the New Testament. The mistake, as he shows, is entirely modern, only since the sixteenth century Kefr Kenna having thus borne away the honours due rightly to Kâna el-Jelîl. Till then, as a long line of earlier travellers and topographers attest, the latter was ever considered as the scene of this miracle. It may have helped to win for the mistake an easier acceptance, that it was manifestly for the interest of guides and travellers who would spare themselves fatigue and distance, to accept the other in its room, it lying directly on one of the routes between Nazareth and Tiberias, and being far more accessible than the true. The Cana of the N. T. does not occur in the Old, but is mentioned twice by Josephus (*Vit.* §§ 16, 64; *Bell. Jud.* i. 17. 5). The O. T. has only Kanah in Asher (Josh. xix. 28), S.E. of Tyre. To prevent confusion our Cana is always mentioned with '*of Galilee*' added.

[1] A late tradition adopted by the Mahometans (D'Herbelot, *Biblioth. Orient.* s. v. Johannes), makes St. John himself the bridegroom at this marriage; who, beholding the miracle which Jesus wrought, forsook the bride, and followed Him. Thus the *Prologue to St. John*, attributed to Jerome (Joannem nubere volentem a nuptiis per Dominum fuisse vocatum), but with no closer reference to this miracle. According to Nice-

tolerable confidence recognize in the second but unnamed disciple, whom the Baptist detached from himself, that he might attach him to the Lord (John i. 35, 40). It is in St. John's favourite manner to preserve an incognito of this kind (cf. xiii. 23; xviii. 15; xix. 26, 35), drawing away all attention from himself the teller, and fixing it on the events which he is telling.

None need wonder to find the Lord of life at this festival; for he came to sanctify all human life,—to consecrate its times of joy, as its times of sorrow; the former, as all experience teaches, needing above all such a consecration as only his presence, bodily or spiritual, can give. He was there, and by his presence there struck the key-note to the whole tenor of his future ministry. He should not be as another Baptist, a wilderness preacher, withdrawing himself from the common paths of men. His should be at once a harder and a higher task, to mingle with and purify the daily life of men, to bring out the glory which was everywhere hidden there.[1] How precious

phorus it was not St. John, but Simon the Canaanite, who on this hint followed Jesus; but Κανανίτης attached to his name (Matt. x. 4), and probably the only foundation for this assumption, does not mean 'of Cana;' any more than it means 'of Canaan;' which our Translators writing 'the Canaanite,' as though Κανανίτης = Χαναναῖος, must have assumed. It is rather a term equivalent to ζηλωτής, the title given him elsewhere (Luke vi. 15; Acts i. 13); see, however, on this point Greswell (*Dissert.* vol. ii. p. 128 sqq.). Once a 'zealot,' or 'Cananæan,' as the word is rendered in our R. V., his zeal for freedom, which till then had displayed itself in stormy outbreaks of the natural man, now found its satisfaction in Him who came to make men free indeed.

[1] Augustine, or another under his name (*Serm.* xcii. *Appendix*): Nec dedignatus est conversationem hominum, qui usum carnis exceperat. Nec secularia instituta contempsit, qui ad hæc venerat corrigenda. Interfuit nuptiis, ut concordiæ jura firmaret. Tertullian, in his reckless method of snatching at any argument, finds rather a slighting of marriage than an honouring it in the fact that Christ, who was present at so many festivals, was yet present only at one marriage. Or this at least he will find, that since Christ was present but at one marriage, *therefore* monogamy is the absolute law of the New Covenant. His words are characteristic (*De Monog.* 9): Ille vorator et potator homo, prandiorum et cœnarum cum publicanis frequentator, semel apud unas nuptias cœnat, multis utique nubentibus. Totiens enim voluit celebrare eas, quotiens et esse.

is his witness here against an indolent and cowardly readiness to give up to the world, or to the devil, aught which, in itself innocent, is capable of being drawn up into the higher world of holiness, even as it is in danger of sinking down and coming under the law of the flesh and of the world! Nor is it without its significance, that this should have been *a marriage*, which He 'adorned and beautified with his presence and first miracle that He wrought.' No human relation is the type of so deep a spiritual mystery (cf. iii. 29; Matt. ix. 15; xxii. 1–14; xxv. 10; Rev. xix. 7; xxi. 2, 9; xxii. 17; 2 Cor. xi. 2), so worthy therefore of the highest honour. He foresaw too that, despite of this, some hereafter should arise in his Church who would despise marriage (1 Tim. iv. 3), or, if not despise, yet fail to give the Christian family all its dignity and honour.[1] These should find no countenance from Him.[2] Yet with all this Bengel certainly has right when he urges that a presence of his at a marriage festival would scarcely have found place save in the earlier periods of his ministry. The shadows fell so heavily upon his soul, as the unbelief of the world fully revealed itself to Him, with his own rejection and all which would follow

[1] Epiphanius (*Hæres.* lxvii.); Augustine (*In Ev. Joh. tract.* xix.): Quod Dominus invitatus venerit ad nuptias, etiam exceptâ mysticâ significatione, confirmare voluit quod ipse fecit.

[2] What a contrast does his presence here offer to the manner in which even a St. Cyprian yields up these very marriage festivals as occasions where purity must suffer; so that his counsel is, not to dispute them with the world, to vindicate them anew for holiness and for God, but only to avoid them altogether (*De Hab. Virg.* 3): Et quoniam continentiæ bonum quærimus, perniciosa quæque et infesta vitemus. Nec illa prætereo quæ dum negligentiâ in usum veniunt, contra pudicos et sobrios mores licentiam sibi de usurpatione fecerunt. Quasdam non pudet nubentibus interesse. Nuptiarum festa improba et convivia lasciva vitentur, quorum periculosa contagio est. Compare the picture which Chrysostom gives of marriage festivals in his time (tom. iii. p. 195, Bened. ed.),—melancholy witnesses, yet not, as some would persuade us, of a Church entangled anew in heathen defilements, but of one which had not as yet leavened an essentially heathen, though nominally Christian, society, through and through with its own life and power.

on that rejection, that the mirth of such a festival, holy as it was or might be, would have too ill consented with the intense sadness of that time.[1]

'*And when they wanted wine*,'—or, which is a better rendering (R.V.), '*when the wine failed,—the mother of Jesus saith unto Him, They have no wine.*' His and his disciples' presence, unlooked for perhaps, as of those just arrived from a journey, may have increased beyond expectation the number of the guests; and so the provision made for their entertainment have fallen short. The Mother of Jesus, always in St. John's Gospel, spoken of by this circumlocution, and not directly named, from one reason or another, did not account it unseemly to interfere with, and in some sort to guide, the festal arrangements.[2] Perhaps she was near of kin to the bridegroom or the bride; at all events she was concerned at the embarrassments of that humble household, and would willingly have removed them. Yet what exactly she expected from her divine Son, when she thus brought their need before Him, is not so easy to determine. Something it is clear she did expect; and this, like the message of the sisters of Bethany, 'He whom Thou lovest is sick' (John xi. 3), must be regarded as an implicit prayer. She could not, from anterior displays of his power and grace (for see ver. 11), have now been emboldened to look for further manifestations of the same. Some indeed take not so absolutely the denial of all miracles preceding, but with this limitation understood:—this was the first of his mighty works wherein He *showed forth* his glory; other such works He may have performed already in the inner circle of his family, and thus have led them to expect more

[1] Magna facilitas Domini. Nuptiis interest primo tempore, dum discipulos allicit, per severiores inde vias progressurus ad crucem, ad gloriam.

[2] Lightfoot (*Harmony*, in loc.; cf. Greswell, *Dissert.* vol. ii. p. 120) supposes it a marriage in the house of Mary (John xix. 25), wife of Cleophas.

open displays of his grace and power. But, without evading thus the Evangelist's plain declaration, we may well understand how she, who had kept and pondered in her heart all the tokens and prophetic intimations of the coming glory of her Son (Luke ii. 19, 51), should believe that in Him powers were latent, which, however He had restrained them until now, He could and would put forth, whenever a fit time had arrived.[1] This is more probable than that she had no definite purpose in these words; but only turned to Him now, as having ever found Him a wise counsellor in least things as in greatest.[2] Bengel's suggestion is curious, that it was a hint to Him that *they* should leave, and thus by their example break up the assembly, before the necessities of their hosts became manifest;[3] and Calvin's, that He should make a pious address to the guests, is more curious still.[4]

But whatever may have been the motives of her interference, it promises at first no good result. '*Jesus saith unto her, Woman, what have I to do with thee? Mine hour is not yet come.*' Roman Catholic expositors have been very anxious to rid this answer of every shadow of rebuke or blame. Entire treatises have been written with this single purpose. Now it is quite true that in the address '*Woman*' there is nothing of indignity or harshness, though there may be the sound of such to an English ear. In his tenderest words to his mother from the cross, He employs the same address, '*Woman*, behold thy son' (John xix. 26). Indeed the compellation cannot fail to have something solemn in it, wherever the dignity of woman is

[1] So Theophylact, Euthymius, and Neander, *Leben Jesu*, p. 370; and see in this sense good observations by Godet, *Comm. sur l'Evang. de St. Jean*, p. 348.

[2] So Cocceius: Verba nihil aliud portendunt quam Mariam tanquam solicitam et parentem operuisse ipsi defectum vini, ex condolentiâ nimirum.

[3] Velim discedas, ut ceteri item discedant antequam penuria patefiat.

[4] Ut piâ aliquâ exhortatione convivis tædium eximeret, ac simul levaret pudorem sponsi.

felt. Thus in Greek tragedy, if one would reproduce the *ἦθος* of the scene, *γύναι* would in passages innumerable be rendered 'lady.' But it is otherwise with the words following, '*What have I to do with thee?*'[1] All expositors of the early Church[2] have found in them more or less of reproof and repulse; the Roman Catholics themselves admit the *appearance* of such; only they deny the reality. He so replied, they say, to teach *us*, not *her*, that higher respects than those of flesh and blood moved Him to the selecting of that occasion for the first putting forth of his divine power.[3] Most certainly it was to teach this; but to teach it first to her, who from her wondrous position as the 'blessed among women' was, more than any other, in danger of forgetting it; and in her to teach it to us all. 'She had not yet,' says Chrysostom, 'that opinion of Him, which she ought, but because she bare Him, counted that, after the manner of other mothers, she might in all

[1] Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί; cf. Judg. xi. 12; 1 Kin. xvii. 18; 2 Kin. iii. 13, where the same phrase is used; classical literature supplies one, and I believe only one example (Aulus Gellius, *Noct. Att.* i. 2). The language is elliptic, and the word κοινόν may be supplied; cf. Josh. xxii. 24; 2 Sam. xvi. 10; Matt. viii. 29; Mark i. 24; Luke viii. 28. It is only out of an entire ignorance of the idiom that some understand the words, 'What is that to thee and Me? What concerns it us twain that there *is* no wine?' For the docetic abuse of these words by the Cathari of the Middle Ages see Gieseler, *Kirch. Gesch.* vol. ii. pt. ii. p. 608.

[2] Two examples for many. Irenæus (iii. 16): Properante Mariâ ad admirabile vini signum, et ante tempus volente participare compendii poculo, Dominus repellens ejus intempestivam festinationem, dixit, Quid mihi et tibi est, mulier? nondum venit hora mea, expectans eam horam quæ est a Patre præcognita. He means by the compendii poculum, the cup of wine not resulting from the slower processes of nature, but made per saltum, at a single intervention of divine power, therefore compendiously. Cf. iii. 11; and Chrysostom ascribes her request to vanity (*Hom.* xxi. *in Joh.*): Ἐβούλετο . . . ἑαυτὴν λαμπροτέραν ποιῆσαι διὰ τοῦ Παιδός, therefore was it that Christ σφοδρότερον ἀπεκρίνατο.

[3] Maldonatus: Simulavit se matrem reprehendere, cum minime reprehenderet, ut ostenderet se non humano, non sanguinis respectu, sed solâ caritate, et ut sese, quis sit, declaret, miraculum facere. St. Bernard had gone before him in this explanation: it was, he says, for our sakes Christ so answered, ut conversos ad Dominum jam non sollicitet carnalium cura parentum, et necessitudines illæ non impediant exercitium spirituale.

things command *Him*, whom it more became her to reverence and worship as her Lord.'[1] The true parallel to this passage, and that throwing most light on it, is Matt. xii. 46–50.

Yet, with all this, any severity which this answer may seem to carry with it in the reading was mitigated, as we cannot doubt, in the manner of its speaking; allowing, as this must have done, a near compliance with her request to look through the apparent refusal. For when she '*saith unto the servants, Whatsoever He saith unto you, do it*,'[2] it is evident she read, and, as the sequel shows, rightly read, a Yes latent in his No. Luther bids us here to imitate her faith, who, nothing daunted by the semblance of a refusal, reads between the lines of this refusal a better answer to her prayer; is confident that even the infirmity which clave to it shall not defeat it altogether; is so confident of this, as to indicate not obscurely the very manner of its granting. And yet this confidence of hers in his new interposition, following so close as it does on that announcement of his, '*Mine hour is not yet come*,' is not without its difficulty. If they were not interpreted by the event, these words might seem to defer not for some briefest interval the manifestation of his glory, but to postpone it altogether to some remote period of his ministry. Indeed, his '*hour*' is generally, most of all in the language of St. John, the hour of his passion, or of his departure from the world (vii. 30; viii. 20; xii. 23,

[1] *Hom.* xxi. *in Joh.* Very beautifully Godet says here, C'est ici pour Marie le commencement d'une douloureuse éducation. Le milieu de cette éducation sera marqué par la question de Jésus, Qui est ma mère, et qui sont mes frères (Matt. xii. 48); le terme par cette seconde allocution, Femme (Joh. xix. 26), qui signalera la rupture définitive de la relation terrestre entre la mère et le fils. Marie sent à Cana, pour la première fois, la pointe du glaive, qui, au pied de la croix, transpercera son cœur.

[2] The words are curiously like those of Pharaoh, when he designates Joseph to the Egyptians as the one who should supply all their needs (*Gen.* xli. 55); the occasions too are not wholly dissimilar. Was the resemblance intentional?

27: xiii. 1; xvii. 1[1]). Here, however, and perhaps at vii. 6, it indicates a time close at hand. So she rightly understood it. Not till the wine was wholly exhausted would his '*hour*' have arrived. All other help must fail, before the '*hour*' of the great Helper will have struck.[2] Then will be time to act, when by the entire failure of the wine, manifest to all, the miracle shall be above all suspicion; else, in Augustine's words, He might seem rather to *mingle* elements than to *change* them.[3]

Very beautiful is the facility with which our Lord yields Himself to the supply, not of the absolute wants merely, but of the superfluities, of others; yet this, as I must believe, not so much for the guests' sake, as for that of the bridal pair, whose marriage feast, by the unlooked-for short-coming of the wine, was in danger of being exposed to mockery and scorn.[4] We may contrast this his readiness to aid others, with his stern refusal to minister by the same almighty power to his own extremest necessities. He who turned water into wine, might have made bread out of stones (Matt. iv. 4);[5] but spreading a table for others, He is content to hunger and to thirst Himself.

The conditions under which the miracle was accomplished are all, as Chrysostom[6] long ago observed, such

[1] It is ὁ καιρός there, ἡ ὥρα here.

[2] Calvin puts it well: Significat se hactenus non incogitantiâ vel torpore cessâsse. Interea subindicat, sibi rem curæ futuram, ubi opportunitas advenerit. Itaque sicut matrem insimulat, quod intempestive festinet, ita rursum miraculi spem facit.

[3] So in the *Appendix* to St. Augustine (*Serm.* xcii.): Hâc responsione interim debemus advertere quod de nuptiali vino pars aliqua adhuc forte resederat. Ideo nondum erat Domini plena hora virtutum, ne miscere magis elementa quam mutare videretur [ne aqua vino admixta crederetur: Grotius]. Maldonatus: Cur ergo miraculum fecit, si tempus non venerat? Non venerat cum mater petivit; venerat cum fecit, modico licet intervallo. So Cyril, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euthymius.

[4] Hilary (*De Trin.* iii. 5): Sponsus tristis est, familia turbatur, sollemnitas nuptialis convivii periclitatur.

[5] Augustine (*Serm.* cxxiii. 2): Qui poterat talia facere, dignatus est indigere. Qui fecit de aquâ vinum, potuit facere et de lapidibus panem.

[6] *Hom.* xxii. *in Joh.*

as exclude every suspicion of collusion. '*And there were set there six waterpots of stone, after the manner of the purifying of the Jews, containing two or three firkins apiece.*[1] *Jesus saith unto them, Fill the waterpots with water. And they filled them up to the brim.*' They were vessels for *water*, not for *wine*; thus none could insinuate that probably some sediment of wine remained in them, which, lending a flavour to water poured on it, formed thus a thinnest kind of wine; as every suggestion of the kind is excluded by the praise which the ruler of the feast bestows upon the new supply (ver. 10). The circumstance of these vessels being at hand is accounted for. They were there by no premeditated plan, but in accordance with the customs and traditionary observances of the Jews in the matter of washing (Matt. xv. 2; xxiii. 25; Mark vii. 2–4; Luke xi. 38); for this seems more probable than that this '*purifying*' has reference to any distinctly commanded legal observances. The quantity, too, which these vessels contained, was enormous; not such as might have been brought in unobserved, but '*two or three firkins apiece.*' And the vessels were empty; those therefore who on that bidding had filled them, as they knew, with water, became themselves by this act of theirs witnesses to the reality of the miracle. But for this it might only have appeared, as in fact it did only appear to the ruler of the feast, that the wine came from some unexpected quarter; he '*knew not whence it was; but the servants which drew the water*,'[2]—

[1] Westcott quotes from Clarke's *Travels*, vol. ii. p. 445, a remarkable illustration. He writes: 'Walking among these ruins [at Cana] we saw large massy stone waterpots, not preserved or exhibited as relics, but lying about, disregarded by the present inhabitants. From their appearance and the number of them, it was quite evident that the practice of keeping water in large stone pots holding from eighteen to twenty-seven gallons, was once common in the country.

[2] The Vulgate rightly: Qui hauserant. De Wette: Welche das Wasser geschöpfet hatten. So the Ambrosian Hymn:

Vel hydriis plenis aquæ
Vino saporem infuderis,
Hausit minister conscius
Quod ipse non impleverat.

not, that is, the water now made wine, but who *had drawn* the simple element on which the Lord put forth his transmuting powers—'*knew*.'

'*And He saith unto them, Draw out now, and bear unto the governor of the feast.*' It has been debated whether this '*governor*' was himself one of the guests, set either by general consent or by the selection of the host over the banquet; or a chief attendant, charged with ordering the course of the entertainment, and overlooking the ministrations of the inferior servants.[1] The analogy of Greek and Roman usages[2] points him out as himself a guest, invested with this office for the time; and a passage in the Apocrypha[3] shows that the custom of selecting such a master of the revels was in use among the Jews. Indeed the freedom of remonstrance which he allows himself with the bridegroom seems decisive of his position, that it is not that of an underling, but an equal. It was for him to taste and distribute the wine; to him, therefore, the Lord commanded that this should be first brought, even in this little matter allowing and honouring the established order and usage of society, and giving to every man his due.

'*And they bare it,*' water now no more, but wine. Like other acts of creation, or, more strictly, of *becoming*, this of the water becoming wine is withdrawn from sight. That which is poured into the jars as water is drawn out as wine; but the actual process of the change we toil in vain

[1] So by Severus; by Juvencus, who calls him summum ministrum; by Kuinoel, and others.

[2] This ἀρχιτρίκλινος will then answer to the Greek συμποσιάρχης, the rex convivii, magister convivii, modimperator, or arbiter bibendi (Horace) of the Romans. It was his part, in the words of Plato, παιδαγωγεῖν συμπόσιον (Becker, *Charicles*, vol. i. p. 465). He appears here as the προγεύστης. The word ἀρχιτρίκλινος is late, and of rare occurrence; Petronius has triclinarches.

[3] Ecclus. xxxii. 1, 2: 'If thou be made the master of a feast [ἡγούμενος], lift not thyself up, but be among them as one of the rest; take diligent care of them, and so sit down. And when thou hast done all thy office, take thy place, that thou mayest be merry with them, and receive a crown for thy well ordering of the feast.'

to conceive; and can only fall back on the profound maxim: Subtilitas naturæ longe superat subtilitatem mentis humanæ. And yet in truth it is in no way stranger, save in the rapidity with which it is effected, than that which is every day going forward among us; but to which use and custom have so dulled our eyes, that commonly we do not marvel at it at all; and, because we can call it by its name, suppose that we have discovered its secret, or rather that there is no secret in it to discover. He who each year prepares the wine in the grape, causing it to absorb, and swell with, the moisture of earth and heaven, to transmute this into nobler juices of its own, did now concentrate all those slower processes into a single moment, and accomplish in an instant what usually He takes many months to accomplish.[1] This analogy does not help us to understand what the Lord at this time did, but yet brings before us that in it He was working in the line of (*above*, indeed, but not *across*, or counter to) his more ordinary operations, the unnoticed miracles of everyday nature. That which this had peculiarly its own, which took it out from the order of nature, was the power and will by which all the intervening steps of these tardier processes were overleaped, their methods superseded, and the result attained in an instant.[2]

[1] Voici le *vin* qui tombe du ciel, is the exclamation of the French peasantry, when the rain is falling on their vineyards at the right season.

[2] Augustine (*In Ev. Joh. tract.* viii.): Ipse enim fecit vinum illo die in nuptiis in sex illis hydriis quas impleri aquâ præcepit, qui omni anno facit hoc in vitibus. Sicut enim quod miserunt ministri in hydrias, in vinum conversum est opere Domini, sic et quod nubes fundunt, in vinum convertitur ejusdem opere Domini. Illud autem non miramur, quia omni anno fit: assiduitate amisit admirationem. And again (*Serm.* cxxiii. 3): Quæ aqua erat, vinum factum viderunt homines et obstupuerunt. Quid aliud fit de pluviâ per radicem vitis? Ipse illa fecit, ipse ista; illa ut pascaris, ista ut mireris. So also *De Gen. ad Litt.* vi. 13. Chrysostom (*Hom.* xxii. *in Joh.*): Δεικνὺς ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ ἐν ταῖς ἀμπέλοις τὸ ὕδωρ μεταβάλλων, καὶ τὸν ὑετὸν διὰ τῆς ῥίζης εἰς οἶνον τρέπων, καὶ ὅπερ ἐν τῷ φυτῷ διὰ πολλοῦ χρόνου γίνεται, τοῦτο ἀθρόον ἐν τῷ γάμῳ εἰργάσατο. Cf. Gregory the Great, *Moral.* vi. 15; and Theodoret, *Hær. Fab. Comp.* l. 5, who calls it ἀγεώργητον οἶνον.

'*When the ruler of the feast had tasted the water that was made wine, and knew not whence it was* (*but the servants which drew the water knew*), *the governor of the feast called the bridegroom*,'—called, that is, to him,[1] and with something of a festive exclamation, not unsuitable to the season, exclaimed: '*Every man at the beginning doth set forth good wine; and when men have well drunk, then that which is worse: but thou hast kept the good wine until now*.'[2] Many interpreters have been very anxious to rescue the word, which we have rendered '*well drunk*,' and the R. V. '*drunk freely*,' from implying aught of excess;[3] lest it might appear that we had here one of those unseemly revels (*temulenta* convivia Cyprian calls them) which too often disgraced a marriage,[4]—with all the difficulties of Christ's sanctioning by his presence so great an abuse of God's gifts, and, stranger still, ministering by his divine power to a still larger excess. But there is no need to deal thus anxiously with the word.[5] We may be quite sure there was no such excess here; for to this the Lord would as little have given allowance by his presence, as He would have helped it forward by a special wonder-work of his own. '*The ruler of the feast*' does but refer to a common practice, and at the same time notice the motive, namely, that the fineness of men's palates after a while is blunted, and their power of discerning between good and

[1] Maldonatus: Non quod ad se venire jusserit, quod minime fuisset urbanum, sed quod recumbentem appellans interrogaverit, quid optimum vinum in finem reservâsset.

[2] Pliny (*H. N.* xiv. 14) denounces the meanness of some, qui convivis alia quam sibimet ipsis ministrant, *aut procedente mensâ* subjiciunt. Compare Juvenal, *Sat.* iv. 24–37.

[3] Cf. *Gen.* xliii. 34, LXX, where the same word occurs; and still more to the point, Ps. xxxvii. 9.

[4] *De Hab. Virg.* 3.

[5] Augustine, indeed, goes further than any, for he makes not merely the guests, but the ruler of the feast himself to have '*well drunk*' indeed. The Lord not merely made wine, but, he adds (*De Gen. ad Litt.* vi. 13), tale vinum, quod *ebrius* etiam conviva laudaret. Uvidi is the very strongest term that could have been applied to these.

bad is abated; and thus an inferior wine passes with them then, such as would not have passed with them at an earlier hour. There is no special reference to the guests present, but only to the corrupt customs and fashions too common in the world;[1]—and none would find one, who were not eager to mar, if by any means they could, the image of a perfect holiness, which offends and rebukes them.

Of a piece with this is *their* unworthy objection, to whom the miracle is incredible, seeing that, even if the Lord did not minister to an excess already commenced, still by the creation of 'so large and perilous a quantity of wine' (for the quantity *was* enormous[2]), He would have put temptation in men's way. With the same justice every good gift of God which is open to any possible abuse, every plenteous return of the field, every large abundance of the vineyard, might be accused of being a temptation put in men's way; and so in some sort it is (cf. Luke xii. 16), a proving of men's temperance and moderation in the midst of abundance.[3] For man is not to be perfected by exemption *from* temptation, but rather by victory *in* temptation; and the only temperance which has any value, which indeed deserves the name, has its

[1] Bengel well: Simpliciter recensetur oratio architriclini et consuetudo etiam Judæorum; ebrietas non approbatur.

[2] The Attic μετρητής (=βάδος=72 ξέσται=72 sextarii) contains 8 gallons 7·365 pints, imperial measure; so that each of these six vessels, containing two or three μετρηταί apiece, did in round numbers hold some twenty gallons or more.

[3] Calvin: Nostro vitio fit, si ejus benignitas irritamentum est luxuriæ; quin potius hæc temperantiæ nostræ vera est probatio, si in mediâ affluentiâ parci tamen et moderati sumus: cf. Suicer, *Thes.* s. v. οἶνος. It is instructive to notice the ascetic tone which Strauss takes (*Leben Jesu*, vol. ii. p. 229), when speaking of this 'Luxuswunder,' as he terms it, contrasted with that which he assumes when he desires to depreciate the character of John the Baptist: but truly he is of that generation that call Jesus a wine-bibber, and say that John has a devil; with whom that which is godlike can in no form find favour. Some of Woolston's unworthiest ribaldry (*Fourth Discourse on the Miracles of our Saviour*, p. 23, sqq.) is spent upon this theme.

source not in the scanty supply, but in the strong self-restraint. That this gift should be large, was what we might have looked for. He, a King, gave as became a king. No niggard giver in the ordinary bounties of his kingdom of nature (Ps. lxv. 9–13), neither was He a niggard giver now, when He brought those common gifts into the kingdom of his grace, and made them directly to serve Him there (cf. Luke v. 6, 7).

But the governor of the feast, who only meant to describe a sordid economy of this world, gave utterance to a deeper truth than he meant. Such at any rate may be most fitly superinduced upon his words; nothing less than the whole difference between the order of Christ's giving and of the world's. The world does indeed give its best and choicest, its '*good wine*,' first, but has only poorer substitutes at the last. '*When men have well drunk*,' when their spiritual palate is blunted, when they have lost the discernment between moral good and evil, then it palms on them that which is worse; what it would not have dared to offer at the first,—coarser pleasures, viler enjoyments, the drink of a more deadly wine. Those who worship the world must confess at last that it is best represented by that great image which Nebuchadnezzar beheld in his dream (Dan. ii. 31); the head showing as fine gold, but the material growing ever baser, till it finishes with the iron and clay at the last.

> 'To be a prodigal's favourite, then, worse lot!
> A miser's pensioner,'

this is the portion of its votaries. But it is otherwise with the guests of Christ, the heavenly bridegroom. He ever reserves for them whom *He* has bidden, '*the good wine*' unto the last.[1] In the words of the most eloquent of our

[1] Thus H. de Sto. Victore (*De Arc. Mor.* i. 1): Omnis namque homo, id est, carnalis primum vinum bonum ponit, quia in suâ delectatione falsam quandam dulcedinem sentit; sed postquam furor mali desiderii mentem inebriaverit, tunc quod deterius est propinat, quia spina conscientiæ superveniens mentem, quam prius falso delectabat, graviter cruciat.

divines, 'The world presents us with fair language, promising hopes, convenient fortunes, pompous honours, and these are the outside of the bowl; but when it is swallowed, these dissolve in an instant, and there remains bitterness and the malignity of coloquintida. Every sin smiles in the first address, and carries light in the face, and honey in the lip; but when we "*have well drunk*," then comes "*that which is worse*," a whip with six strings, fears and terrors of conscience, and shame and displeasure, and a caitiff disposition, and diffidence in the day of death. But when after the manner of purifying of the Christians, we fill our waterpots with water, watering our couch with our tears, and moistening our cheeks with the perpetual distillations of repentance, then Christ turns our water into wine, first penitents and then communicants—first waters of sorrow and then the wine of the chalice; . . . for Jesus keeps the best wine to the last, not only because of the direct reservations of the highest joys till the nearer approaches of glory, but also because our relishes are higher after a long fruition than at the first essays, such being the nature of grace, that it increases in relish as it does in fruition, every part of grace being new duty and new reward.' [1]

Sed Sponsus noster postremo vinum bonum porrigit, dum mentem, quam sui dulcedine amoris replere disponit, quâdam prius tribulationum compunctione amaricari sinit, ut post gustum amaritudinis avidius bibatur suavissimum poculum caritatis. Corn. a Lapide: Hic est typus fallaciæ mundi, qui initio res speciosas oculis objicit, deinde sub iis deteriores et viles inducit, itaque sui amatores decipit et illudit. An unknown author (Bernardi *Opp.* tom. iii. p. 513): In futurâ enim vitâ aqua omnis laboris et actionis terrenæ in vinum divinæ contemplationis commutabitur, implebunturque omnes hydriæ usque ad summum. Omnes enim implebuntur in bonis domûs Domini, cum illæ desiderabiles nuptiæ Sponsi et sponsæ celebrabuntur: bibeturque in summâ lætitiâ omnium clamantium Domino et dicentium; Tu bonum vinum servâsti usque adhuc. I know not from whence this line comes,

Ille merum tarde, dat tamen ille merum;

but it evidently belongs to this miracle.

[1] Jeremy Taylor, *Life of Christ*. Worthy to stand beside this, and unfolding the same thought, is that exquisite poem in *The Christian Year*, upon the second Sunday after Epiphany, suggested by this miracle,

'*This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee*,' —even there where it was prophesied long before that the people which sat in darkness should see great light (Isai. ix. 2; Matt. iv. 14–16). The Evangelist expressly and pointedly excludes from historic credit the miracles of the Infancy, which are found in such rank abundance in nearly all the apocryphal Gospels; for, of course, he does not mean that this was the first miracle which Jesus wrought in Cana, but that this miracle in Cana was the first which He wrought;[1] and the Church has ever regarded these words as decisive on this point.[2] The statement is important, and connects itself with one main purpose of St. John in his Gospel, namely, to repel and remove all unreal notions concerning the person of his Lord—notions which nothing would have helped more to uphold than those merely phantastic and capricious miracles,—favourites, therefore, with all manner of docetic heretics,—which are ascribed to his Infancy.

Of none less or lower than the Son could it be affirmed that He '*manifested forth His glory*;' for '*glory*' (δόξα) here being no creaturely attribute but a divine, comprehended and involved in the idea of the Logos as the absolute Light, every lesser or lower would have manifested forth the glory of God; He only, being God, could manifest forth his own. As God, as therefore Lord of glory (Jam. ii. 1), He rays forth light from Himself, and this

the Gospel of that day; while Plato (*Rep.* x. 613) supplies a grand heathen parallel and commentary, by anticipation, on these words.

[1] Thus Tertullian (*De Bapt.* 9) calls it, prima rudimenta potestatis suæ; and this day has been sometimes called, dies natalis virtutum Domini.

[2] Thus see Epiphanius (*Hær.* li. 20), from whom we gather that some Catholics were inclined to admit these miracles of the Infancy, as affording an argument against the followers of Cerinthus, and a proof that it was not at his Baptism first that the Christ was united to the man Jesus. And Euthymius (in loc.): ἱστόρησεν αὐτὸ [ὁ Ἰωάννης], χρησιμεῦον εἰς τὸ μὴ πιστεύειν τοῖς λεγομένοις παιδικοῖς θαύμασι τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Cf. Chrysostom, *Hom.* xvi., xx., xxii. *in Joh.*; and Thilo, *Cod. Apocr.* p. lxxxiv, sqq.

effluence and effulgence is '*his glory*' (John i. 14; Matt. xvi. 27; Mark viii. 38). The Evangelist, as one cannot doubt, has Isai. xl. 5,—'and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed,'—in his eye, claiming that in this act of Christ's those words were fulfilled. Of this 'glory of the Lord' we hear continually in the Old Testament: thus Exod. xvi. 7; Ezek. i. 28; iii. 23; ix. 23; x. 18; xi. 23; xxxix. 21; xliii. 2. While He tabernacled as the Son of Man upon earth it was for the most part hidden. The veil of flesh which He had consented to wear concealed it from the sight of men. But now, in this work of grace and power, it burst through the covering which concealed it, revealing itself to the eyes of his disciples; they 'beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father.'[1] '*And his disciples believed on Him*' (cf. xvi. 30, 31). The work, besides its more immediate purpose, had this further result; it confirmed, strengthened, exalted their faith, who, already believing in Him, were thus the more capable of receiving an increase of faith,—of being lifted from faith to faith, advanced from faith in

[1] The Eastern Church counted the Baptism of Christ, being his recognition before men and by men in his divine character, for the great manifestation of his glory to the world, for his *Epiphany*, and was wont to celebrate it as such. It has Matt. iii. 13–17 for its Gospel on that day. But the Western, which laid not such stress on the Baptism, saw his Epiphany rather in the adoration of the Magians, the first-fruits of the heathen world; and finds in Matt. ii. 1–12 the appropriate Gospel. At a later period, indeed, it placed other great moments in his life, moments in which his δόξα gloriously shone out, in connexion with this festival; such, for instance, as the Baptism, as the feeding of the five thousand, and as this turning of the water into wine, which last continually affords a theme to later writers of the Western Church for the homily at Epiphany, as it gives *us* the Gospel for one of the Epiphany Sundays. But these secondary allusions belong not to the first introduction of the feast, so that the following passage should have prevented the editors of a new volume of St. Augustine's sermons (*Serm. Inediti*, Paris, 1842) from attributing the sermon which contains it (*Serm.* xxxviii. *in Epiph.*) to him: Hodiernam diem Ecclesia per orbem celebrat totum, sive quod stella præ ceteris fulgens divitibus Magis parvum non parvi Regis monstravit hospitium, sive quod hodie Christus primum fecisse dicitur signum, quando aquas repente commutavit in vinum, sive quod a Joanne isto die creditur baptizatus et Patris consonâ voce Dei filius

an earthly teacher to faith in a heavenly Lord[1] (1 Kin. xvii. 24).

This first miracle of the New Covenant has its inner mystical meaning. The first miracle of Moses was a turning of water into blood (Exod. vii. 20); and this had its fitness; for the law, which came by Moses, was a ministration of death, and working wrath (2 Cor. iii. 6–9). But the first miracle of Christ was a turning of water into wine, this too a meet inauguration of all which should follow, for his was a ministration of life; He came, the dispenser of that true wine which makes glad the heart of man (Ps. civ. 15). Yet as Moses there, where he stands in contrast to Christ, has a change to the worse, so in another place, where he stands as his type, he has, like Him, a change to the better (Exod. xv. 25), changing the bitter waters to sweet; thus too Elisha (2 Kin. ii. 19–22); while yet the more excellent transmutation, which should be not merely the rectifying of qualities already existing, but the imparting of new, was reserved for the Son; who was indeed not a betterer of the old life of man, but the bringer in of a new; who did not reform, but regenerate.

revelatur. In his genuine sermons Augustine knows only of the adoration of the Wise Men as the scriptural fact which the Epiphany commemorates.

[1] This is plainly the true explanation (in the words of Ammonius, *προσθήκην ἐδέξαντό τινα τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν πίστεως*, of Grotius, Credidisse dicuntur qui firmius credunt); not that which Augustine (*De Cons. Evang.* ii. 17), for the interests of his Harmony, upholds; namely, that they are called '*disciples*' by anticipation; because subsequently to the miracle they believed (non jam discipulos, sed qui futuri erant discipuli intelligere debemus); as one might say, The *Apostle* Paul was born at Tarsus. On this, '*his disciples believed on Him*,' Godet says excellently well: L'Apologétique moderne a la tendance de mettre le miracle en rapport avec l'incrédulité, le sens charnel, plutôt qu'avec la foi. Cette manière de voir n'est pas dénuée de vérité; mais prise absolument, elle est certainement fausse. Ces glorieuses irradiations de la personne de Jésus, qu'on appelle les miracles, sont destinées non pas seulement à frapper les regards de la multitude grossière et à stimuler les retardataires, mais aussi à révéler dans un monde de souffrance la richesse du Seigneur, à illuminer par là le cœur des croyants, et à élever leur foi à la hauteur de son glorieux objet.

This prophetic aspect of the miracle we must by no means miss. He who turned now the water into wine, should turn in like manner the poorer dispensation, the thin and watery elements of the Jewish religion (Heb. vii. 18), into richer and nobler, into the gladdening wine of a higher faith. The whole Jewish dispensation in its comparative weakness and poverty was aptly symbolized by the water; and only in type and prophecy could it point to Him, who should come 'binding his foal unto the vine, and his ass's colt unto the choice vine;' who 'washed his garments in wine and his clothes in the blood of grapes' (Gen. xlix. 11; cf. John xv. 1), and who now by this work of his gave token that He was indeed come, that his people's joy might be full.[1] Nor less do we behold symbolized here, that

[1] Corn. a Lapide: Christus ergo initio suæ prædicationis mutans aquam in vinum significabat se legem Mosaicam, instar aquæ insipidam et frigidam, conversurum in Evangelium gratiæ, quæ instar vini est, generosa, sapida, ardens, et efficax. And Bernard, in a preëminently beautiful sermon upon this miracle (Bened. ed. p. 814): Tunc [aqua] mutatur in vinum, cum timor expellitur a caritate, et implentur omnia fervore spiritûs et jucundâ devotione; cf. *De Divers. Serm.* xviii. 2; and Eusebius (*Dem. Evang.* ix. 8): Σύμβολον ἦν τὸ παράδοξον μυστικωτέρου κράματος, μεταβληθέντος ἐκ τῆς σωματικωτέρας ἐπὶ τὴν νοερὰν καὶ πνευματικὴν εὐφροσύνην τοῦ πιστικοῦ τῆς καινῆς Διαθήκης κράματος. Augustine is in the same line, when he says (*In Ev. Joh. tract.* ix.): Tollitur velamen, cum transieris ad Dominum, . . . et quod aqua erat, vinum tibi fit. Lege libros omnes propheticos, non intellecto Christo, quid tam insipidum et fatuum invenies? Intellige ibi Christum, non solum sapit quod legis, sed etiam inebriat. He illustrates this from Luke xxiv. 25–27. Gregory the Great (*Hom.* vi. *in Ezek.*) gives it another turn: Aquam nobis in vinum vertit, quando ipsa historia per allegoriæ mysterium in spiritalem nobis intelligentiam commutatur; while Cyprian (*Ep.* 63) gives yet another. Before the rise of the Eutychian heresy had made it perilous to use such terms as κρᾶσις, ἀνάκρασις, μῖξις, to designate the union of the two natures in Christ, or such phrases as Tertullian's Deo mixtus homo, we sometimes find allusions to what Christ here did, as though it were symbolical of the ennobling of the human nature through its being transfused by the divine in his person. Thus Irenæus (v. 1, 3) complains of the Ebionites, that they cling to the first Adam who was cast out of Paradise, and will know nothing of the second, its restorer: Reprobant itaque hi commixtionem vini cælestis, et solam aquam secularem volunt esse,—so Dörner (*Von der Person Christi*, p. 57) understands this passage: yet possibly he may refer there to their characteristic custom of using water alone, instead of wine mingled with water, in the Holy Communion:

whole work which the Son of God is evermore accomplishing in the world,—ennobling all that He touches, making saints out of sinners, angels out of men, and in the end heaven out of earth, a new paradise of God out of the old wilderness of the world. For the prophecy of the world's regeneration, of the day in which his disciples shall drink of the fruit of the vine new in his kingdom, is here. In this humble supper we have the rudiments of the glorious festival, at the arrival of which his '*hour*' shall have indeed come, who is Himself the true Bridegroom, even as his Church is the Bride.

Irenæus associates this miracle and that of the multiplying of the loaves ;[1] and contemplating them together as a prophecy of the Eucharist, finds alike in each a witness against all Gnostic, as Chrysostom against all Manichæan,[2] notions of a creation originally impure. The Lord, he says, might have created, with no subjacent material, the wine with which He cheered these guests, the bread with which He fed those multitudes ; but He preferred to put forth his power on his Father's creatures, in witness that the same God, who in the beginning had made the waters and caused the earth to bear its fruits, did in those last days give by his Son the cup of blessing and the bread of life.[3]

the passage will even then show how Irenæus found in the wine and in the water apt symbols of higher and lower, of the divine and human.

[1] *Con. Hær.* iii. 11. [2] *Hom.* xxii. *in Joh.*

[3] The account of this miracle by Sedulius is a favourable specimen of his poetry :

Prima suæ Dominus, thalamis dignatus adesse,
Virtutis documenta dedit ; convivaque præsens
Pascere, non pasci, veniens, mirabile ! fusas
In vinum convertit aquas ; dimittere gaudent
Pallorem latices ; mutavit læsa [læta ?] saporem
Unda suum, largita merum, mensasque per omnes
Dulcia non nato rubuerunt pocula musto.
Implevit sex ergo lacus hoc nectare Christus,
Quippe ferax qui Vitis erat, virtute colonâ
Omnia fructificans, cujus sub tegmine blando
Mitis inocciduas enutrit pampinus uvas.

And Crashaw's epigram is graceful:

> Unde rubor vestris et non sua purpura lymphis?
> Quæ rosa mirantes tam nova mutat aquas?
> Numen, convivæ, præsens agnoscite numen:
> Nympha pudica Deum vidit, et erubuit.

It was a favourite subject for earliest Christian Art. On many old sarcophagi Jesus is seen standing and touching with the rod of Moses, the rod of might usually placed in his hand when He is set forth as a worker of wonders, three vessels,—*three*, because in his skill-less delineations the artist could not manage to find room for more. Sometimes He has a roll of writing in his hand, as much as to say, This is written in the Scripture; or the governor of the feast is somewhat earnestly rebuking the bridegroom for having held back the good wine so long; having himself tasted, he is giving to him the cup, to convince him of his error (Münter, *Sinnbild. d. alt. Christ.* vol. ii. p. 92). There is more, at least we confidently conclude so, on these aspects of the subject in a treatise just published (1883) by D. P. Cassel, and entitled *Die Hochzeit von Cana, theologisch und historisch in Symbol, Kunst und Legende ausgelegt,*' which however I have not seen.

2. *THE HEALING OF THE NOBLEMAN'S SON.*

John iv. 46–54.

THE difficulties of the three verses which go before this miracle (ver. 43–45), and which, so to speak, account for the Lord's renewed presence at Cana, are considerable; and the explanations of these difficulties very various. But we need not enter into these. For us it will be sufficient to take up the thread of the narrative at ver. 46: '*So Jesus came again into Cana of Galilee, where He made the water wine.*' It is altogether in St. John's manner thus to identify a place or person by some single circumstance which has made them memorable in the Church for ever; thus compare vii. 50; xix. 39; again, i. 44; xii. 21; and again, xiii. 23, 25; xxi. 20. '*And there was a certain nobleman,*[1] *whose son was sick at Capernaum*'—possibly, as

[1] The precise meaning of βασιλικός here can never be exactly fixed. Chrysostom (*Hom.* xxxv. *in Joh.*) can only suggest a meaning; so that even in his day the point was obscure to them with whom Greek was a living language. Various meanings have been offered. Either he is one of the king's party, a *royalist*, one of those that sided with the faction of the Herods, father and son, and helped to maintain them on the throne, in fact 'an Herodian' (Lightfoot); or '*a king's officer*,' an alternative reading proposed by the R. V.; or, with a narrower signification, he is one attached to the court, 'a courtier,' so in the margin of our Bibles; aulicus, or as Jerome (*In Esai.* lxv.) calls him palatinus (regulus qui Græce dicitur βασιλικός), quem nos de aulâ regiâ rectius interpretari possumus *palatinum* (so Plutarch, *Sol.* 27; *Adv. Col.* 33; Josephus, *B. J.* vii. 5, 2); ein Landvogt oder Amtmann unter dem König Herodes (Luther); or βασιλικός may mean one of royal blood; in Lucian it is four times applied to kings, or those related to them. Perhaps no better term could be found than '*nobleman*,' which has something of the doubtfulness of the original which it renders. I borrow from Malan (*St. John*,

by some has been supposed,[1] Chuza, 'Herod's steward,' whose wife, remarkably enough, appears among the holy women that ministered to the Lord of their substance (Luke viii. 3). Only some mighty and marvellous work of this kind would have drawn a steward of Herod's with his family, into the Gospel net. Others have suggested Manaen, the foster-brother of Herod (Acts xiii. 1). But all this is merest guesswork. What we know of him is this, that whether one of these, or some other not elsewhere named in Scripture, '*when he heard that Jesus was come out of Judæa into Galilee, went unto Him, and besought Him that He would come down, and heal his son; for he was at the point of death.*' From a certain severity which speaks out in our Lord's reply, '*Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe,*' we conclude that this petitioner was one *driven* to Jesus by the strong constraint of an outward need, a need which no other but He could supply (Isai. xxvi. 16), rather than one *drawn* by the inner necessities and desires of his soul; one who would not have come at all, unless in a manner compelled.[2] Sharing in the carnal temper of the Jews in general (for the plural, '*ye will not believe,*' is meant to include many in a common condemnation), he had (hitherto, at least) no organ for perceiving the glory of Christ as it shone forth in his person and in his teaching. '*Signs and wonders*' might compel him to a belief, but nothing else; how unlike in this to those Samaritans whom the Lord

translated from the eleven oldest Versions) the following list of renderings: Syriac, 'king's servant;' Armenian, 'one of the royal family;' Georgian, 'government officer;' Slavonic, 'courtier;' Anglo-Saxon, 'under-king.'

[1] Lightfoot, Chemnitz, and others.

[2] Augustine (*In Ev. Joh. tract.* xvi.) takes a still more unfavourable estimate of the moral condition of this suppliant, classing him with those who asked of the Lord a sign, tempting Him: Arguit hominem in fide tepidum aut frigidum, aut omnino nullius fidei: sed tentare cupientem de sanitate filii sui, qualis esset Christus, quis esset, quantum posset. Verba enim rogantis audivimus, cor diffidentis non videmus; sed ille pronuntiavit, qui et verba audivit, et cor inspexit. But coming in that temper, he would never have carried away a blessing at the last.

had just quitted, and who, without a miracle, had 'believed because of his word' (John iv. 41). But 'the Jews require a sign' (1 Cor. i. 22), and this one, in the poverty of his present faith, straitened and limited the power of the Lord. The Healer must '*come down*,'[1] if his son is to be cured. The nobleman cannot raise himself to the height of those words of the Psalmist, 'He *sent* his word, and He healed them.'[2]

And yet, if there be rebuke in the Lord's answer, there is encouragement as well; an implied promise of a miracle, even while the man is blamed, that he needed a miracle, that nothing less than a miracle would induce him to put his trust in the Lord of life.[3] And so he accepts it; for reading no repulse in this word of a seeming, and indeed of a real, severity, he only urges his suit the more earnestly, '*Sir, come down ere my child*,' or '*my little child* (παιδίον), *die*.' He still, it is true, links the help which he seeks to the bodily presence of the Lord; he is still far off from the faith and humility of another, who said, 'Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldest come under my roof; but speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed' (Matt. viii. 8). Much less does he dream of a power that could raise the dead: Christ might heal his sick; he has no thought of Him as one who could raise his dead. A faith so weak must be strengthened, and can only be strengthened through being proved. Such a gracious purpose of at once proving and

[1] Gregory the Great (*In Ev. Hom.* xxviii.): Minus itaque in illum credidit, quem non putavit posse salutem dare, nisi præsens esset in corpore.

[2] Bengel lays the entire emphasis on ἴδητε in our Lord's answer: Innuit Jesus se etiam absenti reguli filio posse vitam dare; et postulat ut regulus id credat, neque profecticnem Jesu postulet suscipiendam cum ipso sanationem apud lectulum visuro. Others have done the same: see Köcher, *Analecta* (in loc.).

[3] Bengel: Simul autem miraculum promittur, fidesque prius etiam desideratur, et dum desideratur, excitatur. Responsum externâ quâdam repulsæ specie et tacitâ opis promissione mixtum, congruit sensui rogantis ex fide et imbecillitate mixto.

strengthening we trace in the Lord's dealings with the man which follow. He does not come down with him, as had been asked; but sends the suppliant away with a mere word of assurance that it shall fare well with his child: '*Go thy way; thy son liveth*'[1] (cf. Matt. viii. 13; Mark vii. 29). And the father is content with that assurance; he '*believed the word that Jesus had spoken unto him, and he went his way*,' expecting to find that it should be done according to that word. The miracle, one might say, was a double one—on the body of the absent child, on the heart of the present father; one cured of his sickness, the other of his unbelief.

A comparison of the Lord's dealings with this nobleman and with the centurion of the other Gospels is instructive (Matt. viii. 5–13; Luke vii. 1–10). Assuredly He has not men's persons in admiration who comes not, but only *sends*, to the son of this nobleman (cf. 2 Kin. v. 10, 11), Himself visiting the servant of that centurion.[2] And there is more in the matter than this. Here, being entreated to come, He does not; but sends his healing word; there, being asked to speak at a distance that word of healing, He rather proposes Himself to come; for here, as Chrysostom explains it well, a narrow and poor faith is enlarged and deepened, there a strong faith is crowned and rewarded. By not going He increases this nobleman's faith; by offering to go He brings out and honours that centurion's humility.

'*And as he was now going down, his servants met him, and told him, saying, Thy son liveth.*' Though faith had not struck its roots quickly in his soul, it would appear to have struck them strongly at last. His confidence in

[1] For this use of ζῇν as to be healed of any sore sickness, all sickness being death beginning, or death threatening, see Isai. xxxviii. 1; 2 Kin. i. 2, LXX.

[2] Thus the *Opus Imperf. in Matt. Hom.* xxii.: Illum ergo contemsit, quem dignitas sublevabat regalis; istum autem honoravit, quem conditio humiliabat servilis.

Christ's word was so entire, that he proceeded leisurely homewards. It was not till the next day that he approached his house, though a journey from one city to the other need not have occupied many hours; but 'he that believeth shall not make haste.' '*Then enquired he of them the hour when he began to amend,*'[1] to be a little better; for at the height of his faith the father had looked only for a slow and gradual amendment. '*And they said unto him, Yesterday at the seventh hour the fever left him.*' It was not merely, they would imply, that at the hour they name there was a turning-point in the disorder, and the violence of the fever abated; but it '*left*[2] *him*' altogether; as in the case of Simon's wife's mother, who, at Christ's word, 'immediately arose and ministered unto them' (Luke iv. 39). '*So the father knew that it was at the same hour, in the which Jesus said unto him, Thy son liveth:*[3] *and himself believed, and his whole house.*' This he did for all the benefits which the Lord had bestowed on him, accepting another and crowning benefit, even the cup of salvation; and not he alone; for his conversion drew after it that of all who belonged to him; for by consequences such as these God brings us to a consciousness of the manner in which not merely the great community of mankind, but each smaller community, a nation, or as in this case a family, is united and bound together under its federal head, shares in the good or in the evil which is his (cf. Acts xvi. 15, 34; xviii. 8[4]).

[1] Κομψότερον ἔσχε = meliuscule se habuit. Κομψός from κομέω—so in Latin, comptus, for adorned in any way. Thus in Arrian (*Diss. Epict.* iii. 10) κομψῶς ἔχεις = belle habes (Cicero) are the words of the physician to his patient that is getting better. Godet: Le terme choisi κομψότερον va bien dans la bouche d'un homme de qualité. C'est l'expression du bien-être, comme on dit quelquefois, joliment.

[2] Ammonius (*in Catenâ*): Οὐ γὰρ ἁπλῶς, οὐδὲ ὡς ἔτυχεν, ἀπηλλάγη τῆς ἀσθενείας τὸ παιδίον, ἀλλ' ἀθρόον, ὡς φαίνεσθαι μὴ φύσεως ἀκολουθίαν εἶναι τὸ θαῦμα, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

[3] A beautiful remark of Bengel's: Quo curatius divina opera et beneficia considerantur, eo plus nutrimenti fides acquirit.

[4] The Jews have their miracle, evidently founded upon, and in rivalry

But did he not believe already? Was not this healing itself a gracious reward of his faith? Yes, he believed that particular word of the Lord's; but this is something more, the entering into the number of Christ's disciples, the yielding of himself to Him as to the promised Messiah. Or, admitting that he already truly believed, there may be indicated here a strengthening and augmenting of his faith. For faith may be true, and yet most capable of this increase. In him who cried, 'Lord, I believe; help Thou mine unbelief' (Mark ix. 24), faith was indeed born, though as yet its actings were weak and feeble. After, and in consequence of, the first miracle of the water made wine, Christ's 'disciples *believed* on Him' (John ii. 11); who yet, being disciples, must have believed on Him already.[1] Apostles themselves exclaim, 'Lord, *increase* our faith' (Luke xvii. 5). The Israelites of old, who followed Moses through the Red Sea, must have already believed that he was God's instrument for their deliverance; yet of them we are told that after the great overthrow of Pharaoh and his host, they 'believed the Lord, and his servant Moses' (Exod. xiv. 31). The widow whose son Elijah had raised from the dead, exclaims, 'Now *by this* I know thou art a man of God, and that the word of the Lord in thy mouth is truth' (1 Kin. xvii. 24). Knowing him for such before (ver. 18), she now received a new con-

of, this. Vitringa (*De Synag.* p. 147) quotes it: Quando ægrotavit filius R. Gamalielis, duos misit studiosos sapientiæ ad R. Chanina, Dusæ filium, ut per preces pro eo gratiam divinam implorarent. Postquam eos vidit, ascendit in cœnaculum suum, Deumque pro eo oravit. Ubi vero descendit, dixit, Abite, quia febris illum jam dereliquit. . . . Illi vero considentes, signate annotârunt illam horam, et quando reversi sunt ad R. Gamalielem, dixit ipsis, Per cultum! Nec excessu nec defectu temporis peccâstis, sed sic prorsus factum; eâ enim ipsâ horâ dereliquit ipsum febris, et petiit a nobis aquam potendam. Cf. Lampe, *Comm. in Joh.* vol. i. p. 813.

[1] Beda: Unde datur intelligi et in fide gradus esse, sicut et in aliis virtutibus, quibus est initium, incrementum, et perfectio. Hujus ergo fides initium habuit, cum filii salutem petiit; incrementum, cum credidit sermoni Domini dicentis, Filius tuus vivit; deinde perfectionem obtinuit, nuntiantibus servis.

firmation of her faith (cf. John xi. 15; xiii. 19); and so we must accept it here. Whether, then, we understand that faith was first born in him now, or, being born already, received now a notable increase, it is plain in either case that the Lord by those words of his, '*Except ye see signs and wonders ye will not believe*,'[1] could not have intended to cast any slight on miracles, as a mean whereby men may be brought to the truth; or, having been brought, are more strongly established in the same.

One question before leaving this miracle claims a brief discussion, namely, whether this is the same history as that of the servant (*παῖς*) of the centurion (Matt. viii. 5; Luke vii. 2); here repeated with only immaterial variations. It would almost seem as if Irenæus[2] had thought so; and some in the time of Chrysostom identified the two miracles; who himself, however, properly rejects this rolling up of the two narratives into one. By Ewald too this identification is taken for granted, though without the smallest attempt at proof.[3] There is nothing to warrant it, almost nothing to render it plausible. Not merely the external circumstances are widely different;

[1] This passage and Matt. xii. 38–40; xvi. 1–4, have been often urged by those who deny that Christ laid any special stress on his miracles as proving his divine mission and authority. The words of St. Matthew, indeed, have been stretched into proofs that He did not even *claim* to do any. Thus it has been dealt with by modern rationalists, though the abuse of the passage is as old as Aquinas, who takes note of and rebukes it. Our Lord is, indeed, as far as possible from denying the value of miracles, or affirming that He will do none (Matt. xi. 4, 5; John xiv. 11; xv. 24); but only saying that He will do none *for them*, for an evil and adulterous generation, which is seeking, not helps and confirmations of faith, but excuses and subterfuges for unbelief. These works of grace and power are reserved for such as are receptive of impressions from them; seals which shall seal softened hearts; hearts utterly cold and hard would take no impression from them, and therefore shall not be tried with them.

[2] *Con. Hær.* ii. 22: Filium *centurionis* absens verbo curavit dicens, Vade, filius tuus vivit. Yet *centurionis* may well be only a slip of the pen or of the memory.

[3] *Die Johannischen Schriften*, vol. i. p. 197; so too by Semler, De Wette, Baur.

the scene of that miracle being Capernaum, of this Cana; the centurion there a heathen, the nobleman here a Jew (for had he been other, it could not have passed unnoticed, our Lord's contact in the days of his flesh with those who were not of the chosen seed, always calling out special remark); that suppliant pleading for his servant, this for his son; there by others, in person here; the sickness there a paralysis, a fever here; but more decisive still, the inner kernel and heart of the two narratives is different. That centurion is an example of a strong faith, this nobleman of a weak faith; that centurion counts that if Jesus will but speak the word, his servant will be healed; while this nobleman is so earnest that the Lord should come down, because in heart he limits his power, and counts that nothing but his actual presence will avail to help his sick; that other is praised, this rebuked of the Lord. So striking are these differences, that Augustine[1] compares, but for the purpose of contrasting, the faith of that centurion, and the unbelief of this nobleman. Bishop Hall does the same. 'How much difference,' he exclaims, 'was here betwixt the centurion and the ruler! That came for his servant; this for his son. This son was not more above the servant, than the faith that sued for the servant surpassed that which sued for the son.' Against all this, the points of likeness, and suggesting identity, are slight and superficial; as the near death of the sufferer, the healing at a distance and by a word, and the returning and finding the sick well. Assuredly it is nothing strange that two miracles should have such circumstances as these in common.

[1] *In Ev. Joh. tract.* xvi.: Videte distinctionem. Regulus iste Dominum ad domum suam descendere cupiebat; ille centurio indignum se esse dicebat. Illi dicebatur, Ego veniam, et curabo eum: huic dictum est, Vade, filius tuus vivit. Illi præsentiam promittebat, hunc verbo sanabat. Iste tamen præsentiam ejus extorquebat, ille se præsentiâ ejus indignum esse dicebat. Hic cessum est elationi; illic concessum est humilitati. Cf. Chrysostom, *Hom.* xxxv. *in Joh.*

3. *THE FIRST MIRACULOUS DRAUGHT OF FISHES.*

LUKE v. 1–11.

THERE have been in all times those who have deemed themselves bound to distinguish the incident here narrated from that recorded in St. Matthew (iv. 18) and St. Mark (i. 16–20). Thus Augustine [1] finds the divergences in the narratives so considerable, that he can only suppose the event told by St. Luke to have first happened; our Lord then predicting to Peter that hereafter he should '*catch men*,' but not at that time summoning him to enter on the work; he therefore with his fellows continuing for a season in their engagements of this common workday world; till a little later, as by the two other Evangelists recorded, they heard the word of command, 'Follow Me,' which they then at once obeyed, and attached themselves to the more immediate service of their heavenly Lord.

Some difficulties, yet not very serious ones, in bringing the two accounts to a perfect agreement, every one will readily admit. But surely the taking refuge at once and as often as such meet us, in the assumption that events

[1] *De Cons. Evang.* ii. 17: Unde datur locus intelligere eos ex capturâ piscium ex more remeâsse, ut postea fieret quod Matthæus et Marcus narrant. . . . Tunc enim non subductis ad terram navibus tanquam curâ redeundi, sed ita eum secuti sunt, tanquam vocantem ac jubentem ut eum sequerentur. Greswell in the same way (*Dissert.* vol. ii. Diss. 9) earnestly pleads for the keeping asunder of the two narratives. Yet any one who wishes to see how capable they are, by the expenditure of a little pains, of being perfectly reconciled, has only to refer to Spanheim's *Dub. Evang.* vol. iii. p. 337; with whose conclusions Lightfoot (*Harmony*), Grotius, and Hammond consent.

closely resembling one another, with only slight variations, happened to the same people two or three times over, is a very questionable way of escape from embarrassments of this kind; will hardly satisfy one who honestly asks himself whether he would admit it in dealing with any other records. In the extreme unlikelihood that events should thus repeat themselves a far more real difficulty is created, than any which it is in this way hoped to evade. Let us only keep in mind the various aspects, various yet all true, in which the same incident will present itself from different points of view to different witnesses; the very few points in a complex circumstance which any narrative whatever can seize, least of all a written one, which in its very nature is limited; and we shall not wonder that two or three relators have brought out different moments, divers but not diverse, of one and the same event. Rather we shall be grateful to that providence of God, which thus sets us oftentimes not merely in the position of one looker-on, but of many; which allows us to regard the acts of Christ, every side of which is significant, from many sides; to hear of his discourses not merely so much as one disciple took in and carried away, but also that which sank especially deep into the heart and memory of another.

A work treating of Christ's miracles exclusively is only directly concerned with the narrative of St. Luke, for in that only this miracle appears. What followed upon the miracle, the effectual calling of four Apostles, belongs to the two parallel narratives as well—St. Luke's excellently completing theirs, and explaining to us why the Lord, when He bade these future heralds of his grace to follow Him, should clothe the promise which accompanied the command in that especial shape, '*I will make you fishers of men.*' These words would anyhow have had their fitness, addressed to fishers whom He found casting their nets, and, little as they knew it, thus prophesying of their

future work;[1] but they win a peculiar fitness, when He has just shown them what successful fishers of the mute creatures of the sea He could make them, if only they were obedient to his word. Linking, as was so often his manner, the higher to the lower, and setting forth that higher in the forms of the lower, He thereupon bids them to exchange the humility of their earthly for the dignity of a heavenly calling; which yet He contemplates as a fishing still, though not any more of fishes, but of men; whom at his bidding, and under his auspices, they should embrace not less abundantly in the meshes of their spiritual net.

But when we compare John i. 40-42, does it not appear that three out of these four, Andrew and Peter certainly, and most probably John himself (ver. 35), had been already called? No doubt they had then, on the banks of Jordan, been brought into a transient fellowship with their future Lord; but, after that momentary contact, had returned to their ordinary occupations, and only at this later period attached themselves finally and fully to Him, henceforth following Him whithersoever He went.[2] This miracle most probably it was, as indeed seems intimated at ver. 8, which stirred the very depths of their hearts, giving them such new insights into the glory of Christ's person, as prepared them to yield themselves without reserve to his service. Everything here bears evidence that not now for the first time He and they have met. So far from their betraying no previous familiarity with the Lord, as some have affirmed, Peter, calling Him '*Master*,' and saying, '*Nevertheless at thy word, I will let down the net*,' implies that he had already received impressions of his

[1] *Auct. Oper. Imperf. in Matth. Hom.* vi.: Futuræ dignitatis gratiam artificii sui opere prophetantes. Augustine (*Serm. Inedd., Serm.* lviii.): Petrus piscator non posuit retia, sed mutavit.

[2] It is often said that the other was, vocatio ad notitiam et familiaritatem, or, ad fidem: this, ad apostolatum. See the remarks of Scultetus, *Crit. Sac.* vol. vi. p. 1956.

power, and of the authority which went with his words. Moreover, the *two* callings, a first and on this a second, are quite in the manner of that divine Teacher, who would hasten nothing, who was content to leave spiritual processes to advance as do natural; who could bide his time, and did not expect the full corn in the ear on the same day that He had cast the seed into the furrow. On that former occasion He sowed the seed of his word in the hearts of Andrew and Peter; which having done, He left it to germinate; till now returning He found it ready to bear the ripe fruits of faith. Not that we need therefore presume such gradual processes *in all*. But as some statues are cast in a mould and at an instant, others only little by little hewn and shaped and polished, as their several material, metal or stone, demands the one process or the other, so are there, to use a memorable expression of Donne's, '*fusile* Apostles' like St. Paul, whom one and the same lightning-flash from heaven at once melts and moulds; and others who by a more patient process, here a little and there a little, are shaped and polished into that perfect image, to which the Lord, the great master-sculptor, will have them finally attain.

'*And it came to pass, that, as the people pressed upon Him to hear the word of God, He stood by the lake of Gennesaret;*' by that lake whose shores had been long ago designated by the prophet Isaiah as a chief scene of the beneficent activity of Messiah (Isai. ix. 1, 2); and, as He stood, He '*saw two ships standing by the lake: but the fishermen were gone out of them, and were washing their nets.*[1] *And He entered into one of the ships, which was*

[1] It is profitably remarked by a mystic writer of the Middle Ages, that this their washing and repairing (Matt. iv. 21) of their nets, after they had used them, ought ever to be imitated by all '*fishers of men*,' after they have cast in *their* nets for a draught; they too should seek carefully to purify and cleanse themselves from aught which in that very act they may have gathered of sin, impurities of vanity, of self-elation,

Simon's, and prayed him that he would thrust out a little from the land. And He sat down, and taught the people out of the ship. Now when He had left speaking, He said unto Simon, Launch out into the deep, and let down your nets[1] *for a draught.*' This He says, designing Himself, the meanwhile, to take the fisherman in *his* net. For He, who by the foolish things of the world would confound the wise, and by the weak things of the world would confound the strong,[2] who meant, as Augustine has it, to draw emperors to Himself by fishermen, and not fishermen by emperors, lest his Church should even seem to stand in the wisdom and power of men rather than of God—He saw in these simple fishermen of the Galilæan lake the aptest instruments for his work.[3] '*And Simon answering said unto Him, Master,*[4] *we have toiled all the night,*[5] *and have taken nothing;*' but, with the beginnings of no weak faith already working within him, he adds, '*nevertheless at thy word I will let down the net*'—for these are not the

or of any other kind; only so can they hope effectually to use their nets for another draught.

[1] Here δίκτυον, from the old δικεῖν (which re-appears in δίσκος, a quoit), to throw; but at Matt. iv. 18; Mark i. 16, specialized as ἀμφίβληστρον (= ἀμφιβολή), a *casting* net, as its derivation from ἀμφιβάλλω plainly shows; in Latin, funda or jaculum. Its circular bell-like shape adapted it to the office of a mosquito net, to which Herodotus (ii. 95) tells us the Egyptian fishermen turned it; but see Blakesley, *Herodotus* (in loc.); and my *Synonyms of the New Testament*, § 64.

[2] Compare the call of the prophet Amos: 'I was no prophet, neither was I a prophet's son, but I was an herdman, and a gatherer of sycomore fruit; and the Lord took me as I followed the flock, and the Lord said unto me, Go, prophesy unto my people Israel' (vii. 14, 15; cf. 1 Kin. xix. 19).

[3] See Augustine, *Serm.* cccl.xxxi.

[4] Ἐπιστάτα. The word, always in the vocative, and as an address of respect and honour to the Lord, occurs six times in St. Luke, but not elsewhere in the N. T.; ῥαββί, found in the other three Evangelists, he nowhere uses.

[5] See Lampe (*Comm. in Joh.* vol. iii. p. 727) for passages in proof; and add this from Pliny (*H. N.* ix. 23): Vagantur gregatim fere cujusque generis squamosi. Capiuntur ante solis ortum: tum maxime piscium fallitur visus. Noctibus, quies: et illustribus æque, quam die, cernunt. Aiunt et si teratur gurges, interesse capturæ: itaque plures secundo tractu capi, quam primo.

words of one despairing of the issue; who, himself expecting nothing, would yet, to satisfy the Master, and to prove to Him the fruitlessness of further efforts, comply with his desire.[1] They are spoken rather in the spirit of the Psalmist: 'Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it: except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain' (Ps. cxxvii. 1); as one who would say, 'We have accomplished nothing during all the night, and had quite lost hope of accomplishing anything; but now, when Thou biddest, we are sure our labour will not any longer be in vain.' And his act of faith is abundantly rewarded; '*And when they had this done, they enclosed a great multitude of fishes,*' so many indeed, that '*their net brake,*' or better, '*their net was breaking.*[2] *And they beckoned unto their partners which were in the other ship, that they should come and help them.*'

It was not merely that Christ by his omniscience *knew* that now there were fishes in that spot. We may not thus extenuate the miracle. Rather we behold in Him here the Lord of nature, able, by the secret yet mighty magic of his will, to guide and draw the unconscious creatures, and make them minister to the higher interests of his kingdom; we recognize in Him the ideal man, the second Adam, in whom are fulfilled the words of the Psalmist: 'Thou madest Him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; Thou hast put all things under his feet, . . . the fowl of the air, *and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the seas*' (Ps. viii. 6, 8). Of all this dominion bestowed on man at the first, no part

[1] Maldonatus: Non desperatione felicioris jactûs hoc dicit Petrus, aut quod Christo vel non credat, vel obedire nolit: sed potius ut majorem in Christo fidem declaret; quod cum totâ nocte laborantes nihil prehendissent, tamen ejus confidens verbis, iterum retia laxaret.

[2] On the nets breaking now, and not breaking, as it is expressly said they did not, on occasion of the second miraculous draught of fishes (John xxi. 11), and the mystical meaning which has been found in this, I would refer the reader to what there will be said.

perhaps has so entirely escaped him as that over the finny tribes in the sea; but He who 'was with the wild beasts' in the wilderness (Mark i. 13), who gave to his disciples power to 'take up serpents' (Mark xvi. 18), declared here that the fish of the sea no less than the beasts of the earth were obedient to his will. Yet since the power by which He drew them then is the same that guides evermore their periodic migrations, which, *marvellous* as it is, we yet cannot call *miraculous*, there is plainly something that differences this miracle, with another of like kind (John xxi. 6), and that of the stater in the fish's mouth (Matt. xvii. 27), from Christ's other miracles;—in that these three are not comings in of a new and hitherto unwonted power into the region of nature; but *coincidences, divinely brought about*, between words of Christ and facts in that natural world. An immense haul of fishes,[1] or a piece of money in the mouth of one, are in themselves no miracles; but the miracle lies in the falling in of these with a word of Christ's, which has pledged itself to this coincidence beforehand. The natural is lifted up into the domain of the miraculous by the manner in which it is timed, and the ends which it is made to serve.[2]

'*And they came, and filled both the ships, so that they began to sink.*'[3] It was a moment of fear, not indeed because their ships were thus overloaded and sinking; but rather that now this sign revealed to them something in the Lord which before they had not apprehended, and

[1] Thus Yarrell (*Hist. of British Fishes*, vol. i. p. 125): 'At Brighton in June 1808, the shoal of mackerel was so great, that one of the boats had the meshes of her nets so completely occupied by them that it was impossible to drag them in. The fish and nets therefore in the end sunk together.' Compare Tristram, *The Natural History of the Bible*, p. 285; Dean Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, pp. 367, 369; and Wilson, who speaks of the fish in the lake being seen in dense masses, *Recovery of Jerusalem*, p. 341.

[2] See page 13.

[3] Βυθίζεσθαι. The word occurs once besides in the New Testament, but then in a tropical sense (1 Tim. vi. 9).

which filled them with astonishment and awe. Peter, as so often, is spokesman for all. He, while drawing the multitude of fishes into his net, has himself fallen into the net of Christ;[1] taking a prey, he has himself also been taken a prey; and the same man now as after, yielding as freely to the impulses of the moment, with the beginnings of the same quick spiritual insight out of which he should be the first to recognize in his Lord the eternal Son of God, and to confess to Him as such (Matt. xvi. 16), can no longer, in the deep apprehension of his own unholiness, endure a Holy One so near. '*When Simon Peter saw it he fell down at Jesus' knees, saying, Depart from me, for I am a sinful man,*[2] *O Lord. For he was astonished, and all that were with him, at the draught of the fishes which they had taken.*' At moments like these all that is merely conventional is swept away, and the deep heart utters itself, and the deepest things that are there come forth to the light; in the words of the Latin poet, *Eripitur persona, manet res.* And the deepest thing in man's heart under the law is this sense of God's holi-

[1] The author of a striking sermon, numbered ccv. in the Benedictine *Appendix* to St. Augustine: Dum insidiatur Petrus gregibus æquoris, ipse in retia incidit Salvatoris. Fit de prædone præda, de piscatore piscatio, de piratâ captivitas.—'Admire,' exclaims Chrysostom, 'the dispensation of the Lord, how He draws each by the art which is most familiar and natural to him—as the Magians by a star, so the fishermen by fish'—a thought which Donne in a sermon on this text enlarges thus: 'The Holy Ghost speaks in such forms and such phrases as may most work upon them to whom He speaks. Of David, that was a shepherd before, God says, He took him to feed his people. To those Magi of the East, who were given to the study of the stars, God gave a star to be their guide to Christ at Bethlehem. To those who followed Him to Capernaum for meat, Christ took occasion by that to preach to them of the spiritual food of their souls. To the Samaritan woman whom He found at the well, He preached of the water of life. To these men in our text, accustomed to a joy and gladness when they took great or great store of fish, He presents his comforts agreeably to their taste, they should be fishers still. Christ makes heaven all things to all men, that He might gain all.'

[2] For once Bengel is wholly astray, when, laying an emphasis on ἀνὴρ ἁμαρτωλός, he appends this note, Vir peccator, major peccator quam infans peccator.

ness as something bringing death and destruction to the unholy creature. 'Let not God speak with us, lest we die;' this was the voice of the people to Moses, as 'they removed and stood afar off' (Exod. xx. 18, 19). 'We shall surely die, because we have seen God,' is the ever recurring cry (Judg. xiii. 22; cf. vi. 22, 23; Dan. x. 17; Isai. vi. 5; 1 Chron. xxi. 20). Below this is the utterly profane state, in which there is no contradiction felt between the holy and the unholy, between God and the sinner. Above it is the state of grace; in which all the contradiction is felt, God is still a consuming fire, yet not any more for the sinner, but only for the sin. It is still felt, felt far more strongly than ever, how profound a gulf separates between sinful man and a holy God; but felt no less that this gulf has been bridged over, that the two can meet, that in One who shares with both they have already met. For his presence is the presence of God, but of God with his glory veiled; whose nearness therefore even sinful men may endure, and in that nearness may little by little be prepared for the glorious consummation, the open vision of the face of God; this which would be death to the mere sinner, being highest blessedness to him who had been trained for it by beholding for a while the mitigated splendours of the Incarnate Word.

It would indeed have fared ill with Peter, had Christ taken him at his word, and departed from *him*, as He departed from others who made the same request (Matt. viii. 34; ix. 1; cf. Job xxii. 17); but who made it in quite a different spirit from his. If Peter *be* this '*sinful man*,' the more is the need that Christ should be near him; and this He implicitly announces to him that He will be. And first He re-assures him with that comfortable '*Fear not*,' that assurance that He is not come to destroy, but to save, which He had need to speak so often to the trembling and sin-convinced hearts of his servants (Isai. xli. 10, 14;

xliii. 1, 5; xliv. 2, 8; liv. 4; Dan. x. 12, 19; Lam. iii. 57; Zeph. iii. 16; John vi. 20; Matt. xxviii. 5, 10; Luke xxiv. 8; Rev. i. 17). And that Peter may have less cause to fear, Christ announces to him the mission and the task which He has for him in store: '*From henceforth thou shalt catch men;*'[1] or, as it is in St. Mark, 'I will make you to become fishers of men.' In these words is the inauguration of Peter, and with him of his fellows, to the work of their apostleship. Such an inauguration, not formal, nor always in its outward accidents the same,—on the contrary, in these accidents displaying an infinite richness and variety, such as reign alike in the kingdoms of nature and of grace,—is seldom absent, when God calls any man to a great work in his kingdom. But infinitely various in outer circumstances, in essence it is always one and the same. God manifests Himself to his future prophet, or Apostle, or other messenger, as He had never done before; and in the light of this manifestation the man recognizes his own weakness and insufficiency and guilt, as he had never done before. He exclaims, 'I am slow of speech and of a slow tongue,' or 'I cannot speak, for I am a child,' or 'I am a man of unclean lips,' or, as here, '*I am a sinful man*;' falls on his face, sets his mouth in the dust, takes the shoes from off his feet; and then out of the depth of this humiliation he rises up another man, an instrument fitted for the work of God, such as he would have never been, if his own earthly had not thus paled before God's heavenly; if the garish sun of this world had not thus set for him, that the pure constellations of the higher world might shine out upon him. The true parallels to this passage, contemplated as such an inauguration as this, are Exod. iv. 10–17; Isai. vi.; Jer. i. 4–10; Ezek. i.–iii.; Judg. vi. 11–23; Acts ix. 3–9; Dan. x.; Rev. i. 13–20.

[1] Godet: La forme analytique ἔσῃ ζωγρῶν, *tu seras pêchant*, fait ressortir la permanence de cette mission, et les mots: *dès maintenant* son caractère tout nouveau.

The Lord clothes his promise in the language of that art which was familiar to Peter; the fisherman is to *catch* men, as David, taken from among the sheep-folds, was to *feed* them[1] (Ps. lxxviii. 71, 72). There is here a double magnifying of Peter's future occupation as compared with his past.[2] It is *men*, and not poor fishes, which henceforth he shall take; and he shall take them *for life*, and not, as he had hitherto taken his meaner prey, only for death. So much is involved in the word of the original,[3] which thus turns of itself the edge of Julian's malignant suggestion,[4] who observed that 'the Galilæan' did indeed most

[1] Origen finds in St. Paul's handicraft a like prophecy of his future vocation. The tent-maker shall become the maker of everlasting tabernacles (*In Num. Hom.* xvii.): Unde mihi videtur non fortuito contigisse ut Petrus quidem et Andreas et filii Zebedæi, arte piscatores invenirentur, Paulus vero arte faber tabernaculorum. Et quia illi vocati ab arte capiendorum piscium, mutantur et fiunt piscatores hominum, dicente Domino: Venite post me, et faciam vos piscatores hominum; non dubium quin et Paulus, quia et ipse per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum vocatus apostolus est, simili artis suæ transformatione mutatus sit: ut sicut illi ex piscatoribus piscium, piscatores hominum facti sunt, ita et iste a faciendis tabernaculis terrenis, ad cælestia tabernacula construenda tralatus sit. Construit enim cælestia tabernacula docens unumquemque viam salutis, et beatorum in cælestibus mansionum iter ostendens.

[2] So in the Christian hymn:

Te piscantem Piscatoris — Cuncta linquis, nave spretâ,
Ad capturæ melioris — Temporalis mundi metâ,
Usum traxit gratia. — Judices ut omnia.

[3] Ζωγρέυειν, from ζωός and ἀγρεύω, to take alive (Num. xxxi. 15; Deut. xx. 16; Josh. ii. 13, LXX); and ζωγρεία, the prey which is saved alive (Num. xxi. 35; Deut. ii. 24). Cf. Homer, *Il.* ζ, 46, where one pleading for his life exclaims,

Ζώγρει, Ἀτρέος υἱέ, σὺ δ' ἄξια δέξαι ἄποινα.

It appears as if the old Italic Version took ζωγρέω in its other derivation (from ζωή and ἀγείρω), for we find the passage quoted by St. Ambrose and other early Fathers, Eris *vivificans* homines: but the Vulgate more correctly, Homines eris *capiens*. See Suicer, *Thes.* s. v. ζωγρέω, and Pott, *Etym. Forsch.* vol. iii. p. 372.

[4] His words are quoted by Theophanes (*Hom.* v.): Ζωὴ μὲν τοῖς ἐνύδροις τὸ ὕδωρ, θάνατος δὲ ὁ ἀήρ· εἰ δὴ τοῦτό ἐστιν ἀληθές, οἱ μαθηταὶ ἄρα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀγρεύοντες διὰ τοῦ κηρύγματος, τῇ ἀπωλείᾳ καὶ τῷ θανάτῳ, ὡς τοὺς ἰχθύας, παραδιδόασι. See Suicer, *Thes.* s. v. ἁλιεύς. Origen supposes (*Con. Cels.* i. 62), that out of a confused remembrance of this passage Celsus styled the Apostles 'publicans and *sailors*' (ναύτας). But this inexactness is of a piece with his ignorance of the number of the

aptly term his Apostles 'fishers;' for as the fisherman draws out his prey from the waters where they were free and happy, to an element in which they cannot breathe, but must presently expire, even so did those.[1] But the word employed—and we must presume that it found its equivalent in the Aramaic—does with a singular felicity anticipate and exclude such a turn. Peter shall take men, and take them *for life*, not for death; quite another catching of men from that denounced by the prophet Jeremiah (v. 26), by Habakkuk (i. 14, 15); or that of which the Preacher speaks (Eccles. ix. 12). Those that were wandering, restless and at random, through the vast unquiet waters of the world, the smaller falling a prey to the greater,[2] and all with the weary sense as of a huge prison, he shall embrace within the safe folds and recesses of the same Gospel net;[3] which if they break not through, nor

Apostles (he speaks of them as ten), an ignorance singular enough in one who undertook a formal refutation of Christianity.

[1] In one aspect indeed the death of the fish, which follows on its withdrawal from the water, may be said to find its analogy in the higher spiritual world. The man, drawn forth by these Gospel nets from the worldly sinful element in which before he lived and moved, does die to sin; but only that by this death he may rise to a higher life in Christ. Origen (*Hom.* xvi. *in Jerem.*): Ἐκεῖνοι οἱ ἰχθύες οἱ ἄλογοι ἀνελθόντες ἐν ταῖς σαγήναις ἀποθνήσκουσι θάνατον, οὐχὶ διαδεχομένης ζωῆς τὸν θάνατον· ὁ δὲ συλληφθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν ἁλιέων Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἀνελθὼν ἀπὸ τῆς θαλάσσης, καὶ αὐτὸς μὲν ἀποθνήσκει, ἀποθνήσκει δὲ τῷ κόσμῳ, ἀποθνήσκει τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ζωοποιεῖται ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἀναλαμβάνει ἄλλην ζωήν.

[2] Augustine (*Enarr. in Ps.* lxiv. 6): Mare enim in figurâ dicitur seculum hoc, falsitate amarum, procellis turbulentum: ubi homines cupiditatibus perversis et pravis facti sunt velut pisces invicem se devorantes. Ambrose: Et bene apostolica instrumenta piscandi retia sunt; quæ non captos perimunt, sed reservant, et de profundo ad lumen extrahunt, et fluctuantes de infernis ad superna perducunt.

[3] Augustine (*Serm. Inedd. Serm.* lix.): Nam sicut rete quos continet vagari non patitur, ita et fides errare, quos colligit, non permittit: et sicut ibi captos sinu quodam perducit ad navim, ita et hîc congregatos gremio quodam deducit ad requiem. Yet this title of 'fishers' itself also fails to set out the *whole* character of the Christian ministry; sets out only two moments of it in any strength, the first and the last,—the Church's missionary activity, as the enclosing within the net, and the bringing safely to the final kingdom, as the landing the contents of

leap over, they shall in due time be drawn up to shore, drawn out of the dark gloomy waters into the bright clear light of day, that so they may be gathered into vessels for eternal life (Matt. xiii. 48).

It is not for nothing that the promise here clothes itself in language drawn from the occupation of the fisher, rather, for example, than in that borrowed from the nearly allied pursuits of the hunter. The fisher more often takes his prey alive; he draws it *to* him, does not drive it *from* him;[1] and not merely to himself, but draws all which he has taken to one another; even as the Church brings together the divided hearts, the fathers to the children, gathers into one fellowship the scattered tribes of men. Again, the work of the fisher is one of art and skill, not of force and violence;[2]

the net upon the shore (Matt. xiii. 48). All which is between it leaves unexpressed, and yields therefore in fitness, as in frequency of use, to the image borrowed from the work of the shepherd; has given us no such names as 'pastor' and 'flock' to enrich our Christian language. That of 'shepherd' expresses all which 'fisher' leaves out, the habitual daily care for the members of Christ, the *peculium*, after they have been brought into the fellowship of the Church. It was, therefore, fitly said to Peter, '*Thou shalt catch men*,' before it was said, 'Feed my sheep;' and each time though not a different commission, yet a different side of the commission, is intended; he shall be both evangelist and pastor. Jeremy Taylor gives the matter a slightly different turn: 'In the days of the patriarchs, the governors of the Lord's people were called shepherds. In the days of the Gospel they are shepherds still, but with the addition of a new appellative, for now they are called fishers. Both the callings were honest, humble, and laborious, watchful and full of trouble, but now that both the titles are conjunct, we may observe the symbol of an implicit and folded duty. There is much simplicity and care in the shepherd's trade; there is much craft and labour in the fisher's, and a prelate is to be both full of piety to his flock, careful of their welfare, and also to be discreet and wary, observant of advantages, laying such baits for the people as may entice them into the nets of Jesus's discipline.'

[1] Spanheim (*Dub. Evang.* vol. iii. p. 350): Non *venatores* Dominus vocatos voluit, sed *piscatores*, non homines abigentes a se prædam, sed colligentes. Yet the image still remains, even in the New Testament, open to an opposite use; thus in the ἐξελκόμενος καὶ δελεαζόμενος of Jam. i. 14 are allusions to the fish *drawn* from its safe hiding places, and *enticed* by the tempting bait (δέλεαρ) to its destruction: cf. Ezek. xxix. 4, 7.

[2] So Ovid (*Halieut.*): Noster *in arte* labor positus: cf. 2 Cor. xii. 16: ὑπάρχων πανοῦργος, δόλῳ ὑμᾶς ἔλαβον. And Augustine (*De Util. Jejun.* ix.): Quare Apostoli neminem coëgerunt, neminem impulerunt? Quia piscator est, retia mittit in mare, quod incurrerit trahit. Venator autem

so that Tertullian[1] finds in this miracle a commencing fulfilment of Jer. xvi. 16, 'Behold, I will send for many fishers, saith the Lord, and they shall fish them.' Those words, it is true, as we first find them, are rather a threat than a promise. It is, however, quite in the spirit of the New Covenant to fulfil a threatening of the Old, yet so to transform in the fulfilling, that it wears a wholly different character from that which it wore when first uttered. There is now a captivity which is blessed, blessed because it is deliverance from a freedom which is full of woe,—a 'being made free from sin and becoming servants to God,' that so we may have our 'fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life' (Rom. vi. 22). But the promise here might be brought with more unquestionable propriety into relation with Ezek. xlvii. 9, 10, and the prophecy there of

silvas cingit, sentes excutit; terroribus undique multiplicatis cogit in retia. Ne hac eat, ne illic eat: inde occurre, inde cæde, inde terre; non exeat, non effugiat. Thus hunting is most often an image used *in malam partem* (Ps. x. 9; xxxv. 7). Nimrod is 'a mighty hunter before the Lord' (Gen. x. 9), where to imagine any other hunting but a tyrannous driving of men before him is idle; as Augustine rightly (*De Civ. Dei*, xvi. 4): Quid significatur hoc nomine quod est venator, nisi animalium terrigenarum deceptor, oppressor, extinctor? Luther, in his *Letters*, speaks of a hunting party at which he was present: 'Much it pitied me to think of the mystery and emblems which lieth beneath it. For what does this symbol signify but that the devil, through his godless huntsmen and dogs, the bishops and theologians to wit, doth privily chase and snatch the innocent poor little beasts? Ah, the simple and credulous souls came thereby far too plain before my eyes.' Yet it is characteristic that the hunting, in which is the greatest coming out of power, should of men be regarded as the nobler occupation; thus Plato (*De Legg.* vii. p. 823 e; cf. Plutarch, *De Sol. Anim.* 9) approves it, while fishing he would forbid as an *ἀργὸς θήρα* and *ἔρως οὐ σφόδρα ἐλευθέριος* (Becker, *Charicles*, vol. i. p. 437).

[1] *Adv. Marc.* iv. 9: De tot generibus operum quid utique ad piscaturam respexit, ut ab illâ in Apostolos sumeret Simonem et filios Zebedæi? Non enim simplex factum videri potest, de quo argumentum processurum erat, dicens Petro trepidanti de copiosâ indagine piscium: Ne time, abhinc enim homines eris capiens. Hoc enim dicto, intellectum illis suggerebat adimpletæ prophetiæ; se eum esse qui per Hieremiam pronuntiârat, Ecce ego mittam piscatores multos, et piscabuntur illos. Denique relictis naviculis sequuti sunt eum; ipsum intelligentes, qui cœperat facere quod edixerat. Cf. Cyril of Alexandria, in Cramer's *Catena*.

the fishers that should stand on Engedi, and of the great multitude of fish with which the healed waters should abound.[1]

But if Christ's Evangelists are as fishers, those whom they draw to Him are as fish. This image, so great a favourite in the early Church, probably did not find its first motive in this saying of our Lord; but rather in the fact that through the waters of baptism men are first quickened,[2] and only live as they abide in that quickening element into which they were then brought. The two images indeed cannot stand together, mutually excluding as they do one another; for in one the blessedness is to remain in the waters, as in the vivifying element, in the other to be drawn forth from them into the purer and clearer air. In one Christ is the Fish,[3] in the other the chief Fisherman. As being Himself this great 'Fisher of men' He is addressed in that grand Orphic hymn attributed to the Alexandrian Clement, in words which may thus be translated:

'Fisher of mortal men,
Those that the savèd are,
Ever the holy fish
From the wild ocean
Of the world's sea of sin
By thy sweet life Thou enticest away.'

[1] Theodoret gives rightly the meaning of the passage: *Λέγει ἰχθύων πλῆρες τοῦτο γενήσεσθαι τὸ ὕδωρ· καὶ ἁλιέας ἕξειν πολλούς· πολλοὶ γὰρ οἱ διὰ τῶν ὑδάτων τούτων εἰς σωτηρίαν θηρώμενοι, πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ οἱ τὴν ἄγριαν ταύτην θηρεύειν πεπιστευμένοι.*

[2] Tertullian (*De Bapt.* i.): Sed nos pisciculi secundum *ἰχθὺν* nostrum Jesum Christum in aquâ nascimur; nec aliter quam in aquâ permanendo salvi sumus. And Chrysostom on these words, '*I will* make you fishers of men,' exclaims, 'Truly, a new method of fishing! for the fishers draw out the fishes from the waters, and kill those that they have taken. But we fling into the waters, and those that are taken are made alive.'

[3] Augustine (*De Civ. Dei*, xviii. 23), giving the well-known Greek anagram of ΙΧΘΥΣ, adds: In quo nomine mystice intelligitur Christus, eo quod in hujus mortalitatis abysso, velut in aquarum profunditate vivus, hoc est, sine peccato esse potuerit. See the art. *Fish* in Smith's *Dict. of Christian Antiquities*, also the art. 'Ιχθύς in the same. In the chasing away of the evil spirit by the fish's gall (Tob. viii. 2, 3), a type was often

'*And when they had brought their ships to land, they forsook all, and followed Him*,' or, as St. Mark has it, with one of those small but never insignificant additions in which he is so rich, '*they left their father Zebedee*[1] *in the ship with the hired servants, and followed Him*.'[2] But what, some ask, was that '*all*' which '*they forsook*,' that they should afterwards magnify it so much, saying, 'Behold, *we have forsaken all*, and followed Thee: what shall we have therefore' (Matt. xix. 27)? Whatever it was, it was their *all*, and therefore, though no more than a few poor boats and nets, it was much; for love to a miserable hovel may hold one with bands as hard to break as those which bind another to a sumptuous palace; seeing it is the worldly affection which holds, and not the world; and the essence of the renunciation lies not in the more or less which is renounced, but in the spirit wherein the renunciation is carried out. These Apostles might have left little when they left their *possessions*; but they left much, and had a right to feel that they had left much, when they left their *desires*.[3]

found in the early Church, of the manner in which, when Christ is near, the works of the devil are destroyed. Thus Prosper of Aquitaine: Christus . . . piscis in suâ passione decoctus, cujus ex interioribus remediis quotidie illuminamur et pascimur.

[1] A Greek form of Zabdi, 1 Chron. viii. 19.

[2] Crashaw (*Steps to the Temple*) has a neat and serious epigram here:

> 'Thou hast the art on't, Peter, and canst tell
> To cast thy nets on all occasions well.
> When Christ calls, and thy nets would have thee stay,
> To cast them well 's to cast them quite away.'

[3] Augustine (*Enarr.* iii. *in Ps.* ciii. 17): Multum dimisit, fratres mei, multum dimisit, qui non solum dimisit quidquid habebat, sed etiam quidquid habere cupiebat. Quis enim pauper non turgescit in spem seculi hujus? quis non quotidie cupit augere quod habet? Ista cupiditas præcisa est. Prorsus totum mundum dimisit Petrus, et totum mundum Petrus accipiebat. And Gregory the Great, following in the same line (*Hom.* v *in Evang.*): Multum ergo Petrus et Andreas dimisit, quando uterque etiam desideria habendi dereliquit. Multum dimisit, qui cum re possessâ etiam concupiscentiis renuntiavit. A sequentibus ergo tanta dimissa sunt quanta a non sequentibus concupisci potuerunt. Cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Quis Dives Salvus?* 20, vol. ii. p. 946, Potter's ed.

A word or two may fitly find place here upon the symbolic acts of our Lord, whereof, according to his own distinct assurance, we here have one. Men's desire to embody the truth which they strongly feel and greatly yearn to communicate to others, in acts rather than by words, or it may be in blended act and word, has a very deep root in our nature, which always strives after the concrete; and it manifests itself not merely in the institution of *fixed* symbolic acts, as the anointing of kings, the delivery of a sod at the sale of land, the breaking of a cake at the old Roman marriages, the giving and receiving of a ring at our own (cf. Ruth iv. 7, 8); but more strikingly yet, in acts that are the free products at the moment of some creative mind, that has more to utter than it can find words to declare, or would fain utter it in a manner more expressive and emphatic than these permit. This kind of teaching, however frequent in Scripture (1 Kin. ii. 30, 31; xxii. 11;[1] Isai. xx. 3, 4; Jer. li. 63, 64; John xxi. 19–22; Acts xiii. 51), pertains not to it alone, nor is it even peculiar to the East, although there most entirely at home; but everywhere, as men have felt strongly and deeply, and would fain make others share in their feeling, they have had recourse to such a language as this, which so powerfully brings home its lesson through the eyes to the mind. The noonday lantern of Diogenes expressed his contempt for humanity far more effectually than all his scornful words ever would have done it. As the Cynic philosopher, so too the Hebrew prophets, though in quite another temper, would oftentimes weave their own persons into such parabolic acts, would use themselves as a part of their own symbol; and this, because nothing short of this would satisfy the earnestness with which the truth of God, whereof they desired to make others partakers, possessed their own souls (Ezek. xii. 1–12; Acts xxi. 11). And thus not this

[1] Intended no doubt as an incorporation in act of Deut. xxxiii. 17.

present only, but many other of our Lord's works were such an embodied teaching,[1] the incorporation of a doctrine in an act; meaning much more than met the natural eye, and only entirely intelligible when this higher significance has been recognized in them (Matt. xxi. 18, 19; John xxi. 19). The acts of Him, who is the Word, are, and are intended to be, themselves also words for us.[2]

[1] Lampe: In umbrâ præmonstrabatur quam læto successu in omni labore, quem in nomine Dei suscepturi essent, piscaturam præcipue mysticam inter gentes instituentes, gavisuri sint. Grotius, who has often traits of delicate and subtle exposition, finds real prophecy in many of the subordinate details here: Libenter igitur hîc veteres sequor, qui præcedentis historiæ hoc putant esse τὸ ἀλληγορούμενον, Apostolos non suâpte industriâ sed Christi imperio ac virtute expansis Evangelii retibus tantam facturos capturam, ut opus habituri sint subsidiariâ multorum εὐαγγελιστῶν operâ; atque ita impletum iri non unam navem, Judæorum scilicet, sed et alteram gentium, sed quarum navium futura sit arcta atque indivulsa societas. Cyril of Alexandria (see Cramer, *Catena*, in loc.) had anticipated this; Augustine too (*Serm.* cxxxvii. 2): and Theophylact (in loc.); this last tracing in their night of fruitless toil the time of the law, during which there was no kingdom of God with all men pressing into it.

[2] Augustine (*In Ev. Joh. tract.* xxiv.): Nam quia ipse Christus Verbum est, etiam factum Verbi verbum nobis est. *Ep.* cii. qu. 6: Nam sicut humana consuetudo verbis, ita divina potentia etiam factis loquitur.

4. *THE STILLING OF THE TEMPEST.*

MATT. viii. 23–27; MARK iv. 35–41; LUKE viii. 22–25.

THE three Evangelists, who relate this history, consent in placing it immediately *before* the healing of the possessed in the country of the Gadarenes. There is not so perfect a consent in respect of the events which immediately preceded *it*; and the best harmonists forsake the order and succession of these events as given by the first Evangelist, in favour of that offered by the other two; as it does not seem that by any skill they can be perfectly reconciled.

It was evening, the evening, probably, of that day on which the Lord had spoken all those parables recorded in Matt. xiii. (cf. Mark iv. 35), when, seeing great multitudes about Him still, '*He gave commandment to depart unto the other side*' of the lake, to the more retired region of Peræa. '*And when they had sent away the multitude*,' which, however, was not effected without three memorable sayings to three who formed part of it (Matt. viii. 19–22; cf. Luke ix. 57–62), '*they took Him even as He was*'[1] (that is, with no preparation for a voyage), '*in the ship*.' But before the voyage was accomplished, '*behold there arose a great tempest*[2] *in the sea*.' A sudden and violent squall, such as

[1] Ὡς ἦν = sine ullo ad iter apparatu.

[2] Σεισμός, which St. Matthew here employs, must be used very rarely indeed for a storm *at sea*; neither lexicons nor commentaries give a single other example. It is the technical word, with or without γῆς, for an *earth*quake, as often in the New Testament (Matt. xxiv. 7; xxviii. 2; Rev. xvi. 18; cf. Amos i. 1); and will designate any other great shaking, literal or figurative. Λαῖλαψ, which the other two Evangelists employ

these small inland seas, surrounded with mountain gorges, are notoriously exposed to, descended on the bosom of the lake; and the ship which bore the Saviour of the world appeared to be in imminent peril. So, humanly speaking, no doubt it was; for these men, exercised to the sea from their youth, familiar with all the changes of that lake, would not have been scared by the mere shadow and ghost of a danger. But though the danger was so real, and was ever growing more urgent, until '*the waves beat into the ship, so that it was now full*,' their Master, weary and worn out with the toils of the day, continued sleeping still: He was, as St. Mark alone records for us, '*in the hinder part of the ship, asleep on a pillow*;'[1] nor was He roused by all the tumult and confusion incident on such a moment. In Him we behold here the exact reverse of Jonah (Jon. i. 5, 6); the fugitive prophet asleep in the midst of a like danger out of a dead conscience, the Saviour out of a pure conscience—Jonah by his presence making the danger, Jesus yielding a pledge and assurance of deliverance from it.[2]

But the disciples understood not this. They may have hesitated long before they ventured to arouse Him; yet at last the extremity of the peril overcame their hesitation,

(Mark iv. 37; Luke viii. 23; cf. 2 Pet. ii. 17), belongs properly to the λέξις of poetry, but, like other words of the same character, found its way into the prose of the κοινὴ διάλεκτος. Hesychius defines it ἀνέμου συστροφὴ μεθ' ὑετοῦ: but darkness as well as rain should be included in the definition of it; in Homer it is constantly ἐρεμνή, or κελαινή. It is something more than a squall. Thus J. H. H. Schmidt, *Synonymik*, vol. ii. p. 244: Die Alten verstanden darunter ganz allgemein den unstäten, aus finsterem Gewölk hervorbrechenden, mit Regengüssen verbundenen, hin und her tobenden Sturm. The storm-wind by which Elijah was rapt from earth to heaven is λαῖλαψ πυρός (2 Kin. ii. 11, LXX), a tempest of fire.

[1] Προσκεφάλαιον, cf. Ezek. xiii. 18, LXX, where the same word is used, and where it can only have the meaning which our Translators have given to it in this place. Some, and among them the R.V., have rendered it 'cushion' here.

[2] Jerome (in loc.): Hujus signi typum in Jonâ legimus, quando ceteris periclitantibus ipse securus est, et dormit, et suscitatur: et imperio ac sacramento passionis suæ liberat suscitantes.

and they did so, not without exclamations of haste and terror; as is evidenced by the double '*Master, Master*,' of St. Luke. This double compellation, as it scarcely needs to observe, always marks a special earnestness on the part of the speaker; and as God's speakings to man are ever of this character, it will often be found in them (Gen. xxii. 11; Exod. iii. 4; 1 Sam. iii. 10; Luke x. 41; xxii. 31; Acts ix. 4); as in man's also to God (Matt. vii. 22; xxv. 11; xxvii. 46; Rev. xviii. 16, 19). In St. Mark, the disciples rouse their Lord with words almost of rebuke, as if He were unmindful at once of their safety and of his own: '*Master, carest Thou not that we perish?*' for in this their '*we*' they included no doubt their beloved Lord as well as themselves.[1] '*And He saith unto them, Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith?*'—from St. Matthew it would appear, first chiding their want of faith, and then pacifying the storm; though the other Evangelists make the rebuke addressed to them not to have preceded, but to have followed, the allaying of the winds and waves. Probably it did both: He spoke first to his disciples, calming their agitation with a word; and then, having quieted the tumult of the outward elements, He again turned to them, and more deliberately rebuked their lack of faith in Him.[2]

[1] On the different exclamations of fear which different Evangelists put into the mouth of the disciples, Augustine says well (*De Cons. Evang.* ii. 24): Una eademque sententia est excitantium Dominum, volentiumque salvari: nec opus est quærere quid horum potius Christo dictum sit. Sive enim aliquid horum trium dixerint, sive alia verba quæ nullus Evangelistarum commemoravit, tantumdem tamen valentia ad eandem sententiæ veritatem, quid ad rem interest? And again (28): Per hujusmodi Evangelistarum locutiones varias, sed non contrarias, rem plane utilissimam discimus et pernecessariam; nihil in cujusque verbis nos debere inspicere, nisi voluntatem, cui debent verba servire: nec mentiri quemquam, si aliis verbis dixerit quid ille voluerit, cujus verba non dicit: ne miseri aucupes vocum, apicibus quodammodo literarum putent ligandam esse veritatem, cum utique non in verbis tantum, sed etiam in ceteris omnibus signis animorum, non sit nisi ipse animus inquirendus. Cf. 66, in fine.

[2] Theophylact: Πρῶτον παύσας τὸν χειμῶνα τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτῶν, τότε λύει καὶ τὸν τῆς θαλάσσης.

'*Of little faith*,' according to St. Matthew He calls them; while St. Mark's, '*How is it ye have no faith?*' must be modified and explained by the milder rebuke which the other Evangelists record. They were not wholly *without* faith; for, believing in the midst of their unbelief, they turned to Christ in their fear. They had faith, but it was not quick and lively; it was not at hand, as the Lord's question, '*Where is your faith?*' (Luke viii. 25) sufficiently implies. They had it, as the weapon which a soldier has, but cannot lay hold of at the moment when he needs it the most. Their sin lay not in seeking help of Him; for this indeed became them well; but in the *excess* of the terror which they displayed: '*Why are ye so fearful?*'[1] in their counting it possible that the ship which bore their Lord could ever perish.

'*Then He arose, and rebuked the winds and the sea; and there was a great calm.*' Cæsar's confidence that the bark which contained him and his fortunes could not sink, forms an earthly counterpart to the heavenly calmness and confidence of the Lord. We must not miss the force of that word '*rebuked*,' preserved by all three Evangelists; and as little the direct address to the furious elements, '*Peace, be still*,'[2] which St. Mark only records. To regard this as a mere oratorical personification would be absurd; rather is there here, as Maldonatus truly remarks, a distinct tracing up of all the discords and disharmonies in the outward world to their source in a person, a referring them back to him, as to their ultimate ground; even as this person can be no other than Satan, the author of all disorders alike in the natural and in the spiritual world. The Lord elsewhere '*rebukes*' a fever (Luke iv. 39), where the same

[1] Οὕτω δειλοί. Calvin: Quâ particulâ notat eos extra modum pavescere; . . . quemlibet vero timorem non esse fidei contrarium, inde patet, quod si nihil metuimus, obrepit supina carnis securitas.

[2] Σιώπα, πεφίμωσο. Cf. Ps. cvi. 9: 'He *rebuked* (ἐπετίμησε, LXX) the Red Sea also;' although there, as in a poem, the same stress cannot be laid on the word as here.

remarks will hold good. Nor is this rebuke unheard or unheeded; for not 'willingly' was the creature thus made 'subject to vanity' (Rom. viii. 20). Constituted as man's handmaid at the first, it is only reluctantly, and submitting to an alien force, that nature rises up against him, and becomes the instrument of his hurt and harm. In the hour of her wildest uproar, she knew the voice of Him who was her rightful Lord, gladly returned to her allegiance to Him, and in this to her place of proper service to that race of which He had become the Head, and whose lost prerogatives He was reclaiming and reasserting once more.[1] And to effect all this, his *word* alone was sufficient; He needed not, as the greatest of his servants had needed, an instrument of power, apart from Himself, with which to do his mighty work; not the rod of Moses (Exod. xiv. 16, 21, 22), and as little the mantle of Elijah (2 Kin. ii. 14); but at his word only '*the wind ceased, and there was a great calm.*'[2]

The Evangelists proceed to describe the moral effect which this signal wonder exercised on the minds of those

[1] A notable specimen of the dexterity with which a neological interpretation may be insinuated into a book of geography occurs in Röhr's *Palästina*, p. 59, in many respects a useful manual. Speaking of this lake, and the usual gentleness of its waters, he adds, that it is from time to time disturbed by squalls from the neighbouring hills, which yet '*last not long*, and are not very perilous (Matt. viii. 23–27).' What his reference to this passage means is more largely expressed by Kuinoel (in loc.). Dr. Thomson, who himself witnessed a violent storm on this lake, which lasted for three days, gives quite a different account. 'To understand,' he says, 'the causes of these sudden and violent tempests, we must remember that the lake lies low [κατέβη λαῖλαψ, Luke viii. 23], six hundred feet lower than the Mediterranean Sea, that the vast and naked plateaus of Jaulan rise to a great height, spreading backward to the wilds of Hauran, and upward to the snowy Hermon; that the watercourses have cut out profound ravines and wild gorges, converging to the head of the lake, and that these act like gigantic funnels to draw down the winds from the mountains' (*The Land and the Book*, part ii. ch. xxv.).

[2] Γαλήνη, not, as some propose, from *γάλα*, to express the soft *milky* colour of the calm sea, but from *γελάω*. So Catullus, describing the gently-stirred waters,—leni resonant plangore *cachinni*; and compare Æschylus, *Prom. Vinct.*, 90.

that were in the ship;—it may be, also on those that were in the '*other little ships*,' which St. Mark has noted as sailing in their company: '*The men marvelled, saying, What manner of man is this, that even the winds and the sea obey Him?*' an exclamation which only can find its answer in another exclamation of the Psalmist, 'O Lord God of hosts, who is like unto Thee? Thou rulest the raging of the sea: when the waves thereof arise, Thou stillest them' (Ps. lxxxix. 8, 9[1]). We see here, no doubt, the chief ethical purpose to which, in the providence of God who ordered all things for the glory of his Son, this miracle was intended to serve. It was to lead his disciples into thoughts ever higher and more awful of that Lord whom they served, more and more to teach them that in nearness to Him was safety and deliverance from every danger. The danger which exercised, should likewise strengthen, their faith,—who indeed had need of a mighty faith, since God, in St. Chrysostom's words, had chosen them to be the athletes of the universe.[2]

An old expositor has somewhat boldly said, 'This power of the Lord's word, this admiration of them that were with Him in the ship, holy David had predicted in the Psalm, saying, "They that go down to the sea in ships, that do business in great waters, these see the works of the Lord, and his wonders in the deep"' (Ps. cvii. 23–30). And as

[1] Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* iv. 20): Quum transfretat, Psalmus expungitur, Dominus, inquit, super aquas multas [Ps. xxix. 3]: quum undas freti discutit, Abacuc adimpletur, Dispargens, inquit, aquas itinere [Hab. iii. 15]: quum ad minas ejus eliditur mare, Naum quoque absolvitur; Comminans, inquit, mari, et arefaciens illud [Nah. i. 4], utique cum ventis quibus inquietabatur.

[2] Bengel: Jesus habebat scholam ambulantem, et in eâ scholâ multo solidius instituti sunt discipuli, quam si sub tecto unius collegii sine ullâ solicitudine atque tentatione vixissent.—A circumstance which has perplexed some, that, apparently, the Apostles were never baptized, except some of them with John's baptism, has been by others curiously explained, that, as the children of Israel were baptized into Moses in the Red Sea (1 Cor. x. 2), so they were in this storm baptized into Christ. Tertullian (*De Bapt.* 12): Alii plane satis coacte injiciunt, tunc Apostolos baptismi vicem implêsse, quum in naviculâ fluctibus adspersi operti sunt.

in the spiritual world the inward is ever shadowed forth by the outward, we may regard this outward fact but as the clothing of an inward truth which in the language of this miracle the Lord declares unto men. He sets Himself forth as the true Prince of peace (Isai. ix. 6, 7), the speaker of peace to the troubled and storm-stirred heart of man, whether the storms that stir it be its own inner passions, or life's outward calamities and temptations. Thus Augustine, making application of all parts of the miracle: 'We are sailing in this life as through a sea, and the wind rises, and storms of temptations are not wanting. Whence is this, save because Jesus is sleeping in thee? If He were not sleeping in thee, thou wouldest have calm within. But what means this, that Jesus is sleeping in thee, save that thy faith, which is from Jesus, is slumbering in thine heart? What shalt thou do to be delivered? Arouse Him, and say, Master, we perish. He will awaken; that is, thy faith will return to thee, and abide with thee always. When Christ is awakened, though the tempest beat into, yet it will not fill, thy ship; thy faith will now command the winds and the waves, and the danger will be over.' [1]

[1] And again, *Enarr. in Ps.* xciii. 19: Si cessaret Deus, et non misceret amaritudines felicitatibus seculi, obliviscremur eum. Sed ubi angores molestiarum faciunt fluctus animæ, fides illa quæ ibi dormiebat, excitetur. Tranquillum enim erat, quando dormivit Christus in mari: illo dormiente, tempestas orta est, et cœperunt periclitari. Ergo in corde Christiano et tranquillitas erit et pax, sed quamdiu vigilat fides nostra: si autem dormit fides nostra, periclitamur. Sed quomodo illa navis cum fluctuaret, excitatus est Christus a fluctuantibus, et dicentibus, Domine, perimus: surrexit ille, imperavit tempestatibus, imperavit fluctibus, cessavit periculum, facta est tranquillitas; sic et te cum turbant concupiscentiæ malæ, persuasiones malæ, fluctus sunt, tranquillabuntur. Jam desperas, et putas te non pertinere ad Dominum; Evigilet fides tua, excita Christum in corde tuo; surgente fide, jam agnoscis ubi sis; . . . Evigilante Christo tranquilletur cor tuum, ut ad portum quoque pervenias. Thus again (*In. Ev. Joh. tract.* xlix.): Fides tua de Christo, Christus est in corde tuo. . . . Intrant venti cor tuum, utique ubi navigas, ubi hanc vitam tanquam procellosum et periculosum pelagus transis; intrant venti, movent fluctus, turbant navim. Qui sunt venti? Audisti convicium, irasceris; convicium ventus est, iracundia fluctus est: periclitaris, dis-

We shall do no wrong to the literal truth of this and other of Christ's miracles, by recognizing the character at once symbolic and prophetic, which many of them also bear, and this among the number. The sea is evermore in Scripture the symbol of the restless and sinful world (Dan. vii. 2, 3; Rev. xiii. 1; Isai. lvii. 20). As Noah and his family, the kernel of the old humanity, were once contained in the Ark tossed on the waters of the deluge, so the kernel of the new humanity, of the new creation, Christ and his Apostles, in this little ship. And the Church of Christ has evermore resembled this tempested bark, the waves of the world raging horribly around it, yet never prevailing to overwhelm it,—and this because Christ is in it (Ps. xlvi. 1–3; xciii. 3, 4); who roused by the cry of his servants, rebukes these winds and these waters, and delivers his own from their distress.[1] We have in Ezekiel

ponis respondere, disponis maledictum maledicto reddere, jam navis propinquat naufragio; excita Christum dormientem. Ideo enim fluctuas et mala pro malis reddere præparas, quia Christus dormit in navi. In corde enim tuo somnus Christi, oblivio fidei. Nam si excites Christum, id est, recolas fidem, quid tibi dicit tanquam vigilans Christus in corde tuo? Ego audivi, Dæmonium habes, et pro eis oravi; audit Dominus et patitur; audit servus et indignatur. Sed vindicari vis. Quid enim, ego jam sum vindicatus? Cum tibi hæc loquitur fides tua, quasi imperatur ventis et fluctibus, et fit tranquillitas magna. Cf. *Serm.* lxiii.; *Enarr. in Ps.* lv. 8; and *Enarr.* ii. *in Ps.* xxv. in init.

[1] Tertullian (*De Bapt.* 12): Ceterum navicula illa figuram Ecclesiæ præferebat, quod in mari, id est seculo, fluctibus, id est persecutionibus et tentationibus, inquietatur, Domino per patientiam velut dormiente, donec orationibus sanctorum in ultimis suscitatus, compescat seculum et tranquillitatem suis reddat. Ambrose: Arbor quædam in navi est crux in Ecclesiâ, quâ inter tot totius seculi blanda et perniciosa naufragia incolumis sola servatur. Compare a beautiful passage in the *Clementine Homilies* (Coteler. *Pat. Apost.* vol. i. p. 609), beginning thus: Ἔοικεν γὰρ ὅλον τὸ πρᾶγμα τῆς ἐκκλησίας νηὶ μεγαλῃ, διὰ σφοδροῦ χειμῶνος ἄνδρας φερούσῃ ἐκ πολλῶν τόπων ὄντας, καὶ μίαν τινὰ ἀγαθῆς βασιλείας πόλιν οἰκεῖν θέλοντας, κ. τ. λ. The image of the world as a great ship, whereof God is at once the maker and the pilot, was familiar to the Indians (Philostratus, *De Vitâ Apollonii*, iii. 35; Von Bohlen, *Das Alte Indien*), and the same symbolic meaning lay in the procession of Egyptian priests bearing the sacred ship (the navigium auratum, Curtius, iv. 7), full of the images of the gods (Creuzer, *Symbolik*, vol. ii. p. 9, 3rd edit.). All

a kingdom of this world set forth to us under the image of a stately and glorious galley (xxvii. 4–9); which despite of all the outward bravery and magnificence it wears utterly perishes: 'thy rowers have brought thee into great waters; the east wind hath broken thee in the midst of the seas;' and they that hoped in it, and embarked in it their treasures, wail over its wreck with a bitter wailing (ver. 26–36); this kingdom of God, meanwhile, this Church of Christ, showing by comparison but as the insignificant fishing-boat which every wave might engulf, rides triumphantly over all, and brings its precious freight safely into the true 'Fair Havens' at last.

this was recognized in early Christian Art, where the Church is continually set forth as a ship, against which the personified winds are fighting (*Christl. Kunst-Symbolik*. p. 159). Aringhi describes an old seal-ring in which the Church appears as this ship, sustained and supported by a great fish in the sea beneath (Christ the ΙΧΘΥΣ, according to Ps. lxxii. 17, Aquila), whilst on its mast and poop two doves are sitting; so that the three Clementine symbols, the ship, the dove, and the fish, appear here united in a single group.

5. *THE DEMONIACS IN THE COUNTRY OF THE GADARENES.*

Matt. viii. 28–34; Mark v. 1–20; Luke viii. 26–39.

THE consideration of this, the most important, and, in many respects, the most perplexing of all the cures of demoniacs recorded in the New Testament, will demand some prefatory remarks on the general subject of the demoniacs[1] of Scripture. It is a subject of which the difficulty is very much enhanced by the fact that,—as with some of the spiritual gifts, the gift of tongues, for example,—the thing itself, if it still survives among us, yet does so no longer under the same name, nor with the same frequency and intensity as of old. We are obliged to put together, as best we can, the separate and fragmentary notices which have reached us, and must endeavour out of them to frame such a scheme as will 'save appearances,' meet, that is, the demands of the different phenomena; we have not, at least with any certainty, the thing itself to examine and to question, before our eyes.

It is, of course, easy enough to cut short the whole in-

[1] The most common name in Scripture for one thus possessed is δαιμονιζόμενος (Matt. iv. 24, and often). Besides this, δαιμονισθείς (Mark v. 18; Luke viii. 36); ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ (Mark i. 23); ἔχων πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον (Acts viii. 7); ἔχων δαιμόνια (Luke viii. 27); ἄνθρωπος ἔχων πνεῦμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτου (Luke iv. 33); δαιμονιόληπτος (Justin Martyr, *Apol.* 2); while ἐνεργούμενος is the more ecclesiastical word. Other more general descriptions are, καταδυναστευόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου (Acts x. 38); ὀχλούμενος ὑπὸ πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων (Luke vi. 18; Acts v. 16); ἐλαυνόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ δαίμονος (Luke viii. 29). In classic Greek, one under the power of an evil δαίμων was said δαιμονᾶν (Æschylus, *Choëphoræ*, 564), κακοδαιμονᾶν, and the state was called κακοδαιμονία, not being, however, precisely a similar condition.

quiry, and to leave no question at all, by saying these demoniacs were persons whom we at this day should call insane—epileptic, maniac, melancholic. This has been often said,[1] and the oftener perhaps, because there is a partial truth in the assertion that these possessions were bodily maladies. There was no doubt a substratum of disease, which in many cases helped to lay open the sufferer to the worse evil, and upon which this was superinduced:[2] so that cases of possession are at once classed with those of various sicknesses, and at the same time distinguished from them, by the Evangelists; who thus at once mark the connexion and the difference (Matt. iv. 24; viii. 16; Mark i. 34). But the scheme which confounds these cases with those of disease, and, in fact, identifies the two, does not exhaust the matter; it cannot be taken as a satisfying explanation of the difficulties it presents; and this for more reasons than one.

And first, our Lord Himself uses language which is not reconcilable with any such explanation. He everywhere speaks of demoniacs not as persons merely of disordered intellects, but as subjects and thralls of an alien spiritual might; He addresses the evil spirit as distinct from the man; 'Hold thy peace, and come out of him' (Mark i. 25). And the unworthy reply, that He fell in with and humoured the notions of the afflicted in order to facilitate their cure,[3] is anticipated and excluded by the fact that in

[1] As by Semler in Germany, *Comm. de Dæmoniacis quorum in Novo Testamento fit Mentio*, Halæ, 1770-1779; by Hugh Farmer in England, *Essay on the Demoniacs of the New Testament*, London, 1775.

[2] Origen (*in Matth.* tom. xiii. 6) finds fault with some (ἰατροί he calls them) who in his day saw in the youth mentioned Matt. xvii. 14, only one afflicted with the falling sickness. He himself runs into the opposite extreme, and will see no nature there, because they saw nothing but nature.

[3] Not to say that such treatment had been sure to fail. Schubert, in his book, full of wisdom and love, *Die Krankheiten und Störungen der menschlichen Seele*, several times observes how fatal all giving in to a madman's delusions is for his recovery; how sure it is to defeat its own objects. He is living in a world of falsehood, and what he wants is not

his most confidential discourses with his disciples He uses exactly the same language (Matt. x. 8; and especially xvii. 21, 'This kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting'[1]). The allegiance we owe to Christ as the King of truth, who came, not to fall in with men's errors, but to deliver men out of their errors, compels us to believe that He would never have used language which would have upheld and confirmed so serious an error in the minds of men as the belief in Satanic influences, which did not in truth exist. For this error, if it was an error, was so little an innocuous one, such as might be left in good time to drop naturally away; did, on the contrary, reach so far in its consequences, entwined its roots so deeply among the very ground-truths of religion, that He would never have suffered it to remain at the hazard of all the misgrowths which it could not fail to occasion.

And then, moreover, even had not the moral interests at stake been so transcendent, our idea of Christ's absolute veracity, apart from the value of the truth which He communicated, forbids us to suppose that He could have spoken as He did, being perfectly aware all the while that there were no corresponding realities to justify the language which He used. And in this there is no making a conscience about trifles, nor any losing sight of that figurative nature of all our words, out of which it results that so much which is not *literally* true, is yet the truest, inasmuch as it conveys the truest impression,—no requiring of men

more falsehood, but some truth—the truth indeed in love, but still only the truth. The greatest physicians in this line in England act exactly upon this principle.

[1] It is hardly necessary to observe, that by this 'going out' that is not implied, which Arnobius (*Adv. Gent.* i. 45) in the rudest manner expresses, when he speaks of gens illa *mersorum in visceribus* dæmonum. The notion of a ventriloquism such as this, of a *spirit* having his lodging *in the body* of a man, could only arise from a gross and entire confusion of the spiritual and material, and has been declared by great teachers of the Church not to be what they understand by this language (see Pet. Lombard, *Sentent.* ii. dist. 8). The German 'besessen' involves a *besitzen*, as ἐγκαθέζεσθαι, yet not as a mechanical *local* possession.

to examine the past history of their words before venturing to use them. It would have been quite a different thing for the Lord to have fallen in with the popular language, and to have spoken of persons under various natural afflictions as 'possessed,' supposing He had found such a language current, but now no longer, however it might once have been, vividly linked to the idea of possession by spirits of evil. In this there had been nothing more than in *our* speaking of certain forms of madness as *lunacy*. We do not thus imply *our* belief, however it may have been with others in time past, that the moon has wrought the harm;[1] but finding the word current, we use it: and this the more readily, since its original derivation is so entirely lost sight of in our common conversation, its first impress so completely worn off, that we do not thereby even seem to countenance an error. But suppose with this same disbelief in lunar influences, we were to begin to speak not merely of *lunatics*, but of persons on whom the moon was working, to describe the cure of such, as the ceasing of the moon to afflict them; the physician to promise his patient that the moon should not harm him any more, would not this be quite another matter, a direct countenancing of error and delusion? would there not here be that absence of agreement between thoughts and words, in which the essence of untruth consists? Now Christ does everywhere speak in such a language as this. Take, for instance, his words, Luke xi. 17–26, and assume Him to have known, all the while He was thus speaking, that the whole Jewish belief of demoniac possessions was utterly baseless, that Satan exercised no such power over the bodies or spirits of men, that, indeed, properly speaking, there was no Satan at all, and what should we have here for a King of truth?

[1] There are cases of lunambulism, in which, no doubt, it has influence; but they are few and exceptional (see Schubert, p. 113). I am speaking of using the term to express all forms of mental unsoundness.

And then, besides this, the phenomena themselves are such as no hypothesis of the kind avails to explain, and they thus bid us to seek for some more satisfying solution. For that madness was not the constituent element in the demoniac state is clear, since not only are we without the slightest ground for supposing that the Jews would have considered all maniacs, epileptic or melancholic persons, to be under the power of evil spirits; but we have distinct evidence that the same malady they did in some cases attribute to an evil spirit, and in others not; thus showing that the malady and possession were not identical in their eyes, and that the assumption of the latter was not a mere popular explanation for the presence of the former. Thus, on one occasion they bring to the Lord one dumb (Matt. ix. 32), on another one dumb and blind (xii. 22), and in both instances the dumbness is traced up to an evil spirit. Yet it is plain that they did not consider all dumbness as having this root; for in the history given by St. Mark (vii. 32) of another deaf and dumb, the subject of Christ's healing power, it is the evident intention of the Evangelist to describe one labouring only under a natural defect; with no least desire to trace the source of his malady to any demoniacal influence. Signs sufficiently clear, no doubt, distinguished one case from the other. In that of the demoniac there probably was not the outward hindrance, not the still-fastened string of the tongue; it was not the outward organ, but the inward power of using the organ, which was at fault. This, with an entire apathy, a total disregard of all which was going on about him, may have sufficiently indicated that the source of his malady lay deeper than in any merely natural cause. But, whatever may have been the symptoms which enabled those about the sufferers to make these distinctions, the fact itself of their so discriminating between cases of the very same malady, proves decisively that there were not certain diseases which, without more ado, they traced up

directly to Satan; but that they did designate by this name of possession, a condition which, while it was very often a condition of disease, was also always a condition of much more than disease.

But what *was* the condition which our Lord and his Apostles signalized by this name? in what did it differ, upon the one side, from madness,—upon the other, from wickedness? It will be impossible to make any advance toward the answer, without saying something, by way of preface, on the scriptural doctrine concerning the kingdom of evil, and its personal head, and the relation in which he stands to the moral evil of our world. Alike excluding, on the one side, the Manichæan error, which would make evil eternal as good, and so itself a god,—and the pantheistic, which would deny any true reality to evil at all, or that it is anything else than good at a lower stage, the immature, and therefore still bitter, fruit,—the Scripture teaches the absolute subordination of evil to good, and its subsequence of order, in the fact that the evil roots itself in a creature, and in one created originally pure, but the good in the Creator. Yet, at the same time, it teaches that the opposition of this evil to the will of God is most real, is that of a will which does truly set itself against his will; that the world is not as a chess-board on which God is in fact playing both sides of the game, however some of the pieces may be black, and some white; but that the whole end of his government of the world is the subduing of this evil; that is, not abolishing it by main force, which were no true victory, but overcoming it by righteousness and truth. And from this one central will, alienated from the will of God, the Scripture derives all the evil in the universe: all gathers up in a person, in the devil, who has a kingdom, as God has a kingdom—a kingdom with its subordinate ministers,—'the devil and his angels.'[1] This world of

[1] The devil is never in Scripture δαίμων or δαιμόνιον, nor his inferior ministers διάβολοι. Δαίμων and δαιμόνιον, the latter in the N. T. of far

ours stands not isolated, not rounded and complete in itself, but in living relation with two other worlds,—a higher, from which all good in it proceeds,—and a lower, from which all evil. It thus comes to pass that the sin of men is continually traced up to Satan; Peter says to Ananias, 'Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost' (Acts v. 3)? and St. John, of Judas Iscariot, 'the devil having now put into his heart to betray Him' (John xiii. 2: cf. 1 John iii. 8; John viii. 44); the Scripture not by such language as this denying that the evil of men is truly *their* evil, but affirming with this, that it grounds itself on an anterior evil. It is *their* evil, since an act of

the more frequent occurrence, are not perfectly equivalent; more personality is implied in δαίμων than δαιμόνιον. Other names are πνεῦμα πονηρόν, πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον, πνεῦμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτου, and at Matt. viii. 16 they are simply τὰ πνεύματα. The word δαίμων (=δαήμων) is derived either from δάω, *scio*, and then signifies 'the knowing,' the full of insight (in oldest Greek δάμων), while to know is the special prerogative of spiritual beings (ὅτι φρόνιμοι καὶ δαήμονες ἦσαν, Plato, *Crat.* 398 B; ob scientiam nominati, Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, ix. 20); or else from δαίω, in its sense of to divide; the δαίμονες are then the *distributors*, the dividers and allotters of good and of evil to men, and δαίμων would thus be very much the same as Μοῖρα, derived from μέρος, a portion. And this derivation is perhaps preferable, in that ever a feeling of the *fateful* is linked with the word. In classic use it is of much wider significance than in Scriptural, embracing all intermediate beings between men and the very highest divinities, whether the deified men of the golden age, or created and inferior powers; and, as well as δαιμόνιος, is a middle term, capable of being applied to the highest and the lowest, and first deriving from its adjunct a good or an evil significance; thus we have ἀγαθοδαίμων, κακοδαίμων. The classical passage on the subject is in Plato's *Symp.* 202, 203. Already in Augustine's time (*De Civ. Dei*, lix. 19) the heathen themselves used δαίμων only *in malam partem*, which he attributes to the influence which the Church's use had spread even beyond its own limits; though a tendency to this use had made itself felt before. Thus if used of a god, it was oftener of a god in his evil workings on men than in his good. The same appears more distinctly in δαιμόνιος, which is never one under happy influences of the heavenly powers; but always one befooled, betrayed, impelled or led by them to his ruin; the Scotch 'fey,' a very wonderful word. On the Greek idea of the δαίμονες, see Creuzer's masterly discussion, *Symbolik*, part III. pp. 719–748, 3rd edit.; Solger, *Nachgelassene Schriften*, vol. ii. pp. 657–675; Nägelsbach, *Homer. Theologie*, p. 72, sq.: and, suggesting quite another derivation than that hitherto recognized, Pott, *Etymol. Forschungen*, 2nd edit. vol. ii. p. 947.

their will alone gives it leave to enter. To each man the key is committed, with the charge to keep closed the gate of his soul; and it is only through the negligent ward which he has kept that evil has found admission there. At the same time it is the existence of a world of evil beyond and without our world, which attaches to any negligence or treachery here such fatal and disastrous results.

This being so, the question which presents itself is this, namely, what peculiar form of Satanic operation does the Scripture intend, when it speaks of men as possessed, or having devils? Is their evil ethical, or is it merely physical? *Merely* physical it certainly is not. Doubtless the suffering of the demoniac often was great; yet we should err, if we saw in him, as in the victims of ghastly and horrible diseases, *only* another example of the mighty woe which Satan has brought in upon our race. Nor yet, on the other hand, is his evil purely ethical; we have in him something else than merely a signal sinner, a foremost servant of the devil, who with heart and will and waking consciousness is doing his work; for this, whatever his antecedent guilt may have been, and often, I should imagine, it had been great, the demoniac evidently is not. But what in him strikes us the most is the strange confusion of the physical and the psychical, each intruding into the proper domain of the other. There is a breaking up of all the harmony of the lower, no less than of the higher, life; the same discord and disorganization manifesting itself in both. Nor does the demoniac, like the wicked, stand only in near relation to the kingdom of Satan as a whole. It is with him as if of the malignant spirits of the pit one had singled him out for its immediate prey; as when a lion or a leopard, not hunting in the mass a herd of flying antelopes, has fastened upon and is drinking out the life-blood of one.

But the awful question remains, How should any have sunken into this miserable condition, have been entangled

so far in the bands of the devil, or of his ministers? We should find ourselves altogether upon a wrong track, did we conceive of the demoniacs as the worst of men, and their possession as the plague and penalty of a wickedness in which they had greatly exceeded others. Rather we must esteem the demoniac as one of the unhappiest, but not, of necessity, one of the guiltiest of our race.[1] So far from this, the chief representatives and organs of Satan, false prophets and antichrists, are never contemplated as such.[2] We all feel that Judas' possession, when Satan entered into him (John xiii. 27), was specifically different from that of one of the unhappy persons who were the subjects of Christ's healing power. Or, to borrow an illustra-

[1] This is exactly Heinroth's exaggeration, tracing up, as he does, insanity in every case to foregoing sin; and not this alone, but affirming that none who had not fallen deeply away from God could be liable to this infliction, that in fact they are the outermost circle of them who have obeyed the centrifugal impulses of sin. But every one who knows what manner of persons have been visited by this terrible calamity, and also what manner of persons have *not*, at once revolts against this doctrine thus stated. Still Heinroth's unquestionable merit remains, that more distinctly, I believe, than any before him, he dared to say out that such cases stood in a different, and *oftentimes* far nearer, connexion to the kingdom of evil than a fever or a broken limb. The mere fact that insanity is on all sides recognized as demanding a *moral* treatment, the physical remedies being merely secondary and subsidiary, is sufficient to put it in wholly another class from every other disease. The attempt to range it with them is the attempt, natural enough in those who know not the grace of God in Christ, to avoid looking down into the awful deeps of our fallen nature. For a list of Heinroth's works, almost all bearing upon this subject, see the *Conversations-Lexicon* under his name. In dealing with this subject he had the inestimable advantage of being at once a theologian and physician. For Schubert's more qualified opinion on the same subject see p. 37 of his work already referred to (p. 163).

[2] Thus the accusation of the people, 'Thou hast a devil' (John vii. 20; viii. 48, 52: x. 20), was quite different from, and betrayed no such deadly malignity as, that of the Pharisees, that He cast out devils by Beelzebub (Matt. xii. 24). That first was a common coarse blasphemy, a stone flung at random; this, which charged Him with being in willing and conscious alliance with the prince of evil, was on the very verge of being the sin against the Holy Ghost (ver. 31). The distinction between wicked men and demoniacs was clearly recognized in the early Church; it had its excommunications for the former, its exorcisms for the latter.

tion from the world of fiction, none would speak of Iago as δαιμονιζόμενος, however all the deadliest malignity of hell was concentrated in him; we should trace much closer analogies to this state in some aspects of Hamlet's life. Greek tragedy supplies a yet apter example. It is the noble Orestes, whom the 'dogs of hell' torture into madness; the obdurate Clytæmnestra is troubled on account of *her* deed with no maddening spectres from the unseen world. Thus, too, in actual life, the horror and deep anguish of a sinner at the contemplation of his sin may have helped on this overthrow of his spiritual life,—anguish which a more hardened sinner would have escaped, but escaped it only by being a worse and a more truly devilish man.[1] We are not then to see in these cases of possession the deliberate giving in to the Satanic will, of an utterly lost soul, but, in many instances at least, the still recoverable wreck of what might once have been a noble spirit.[2]

And, consistently with this, we find in the demoniac the sense of a bondage in which he does not acquiesce, of his true life absolutely shattered, of an alien power which has mastered him wholly, and now is cruelly lording over him, and ever drawing further away from Him in whom only any created intelligence can find rest and peace. His state is, in the most literal sense of the word, 'a possession:' another is ruling in the high places of his soul, and has cast

[1] See the article *Besessene*, by Dierenger, in Aschbach's *Allgemeine Kirchen-Lexicon*, a Roman Catholic work.

[2] Dallæus (*De Cult. Rel. Lat.* i. p. 64) draws well the distinction: Etsi quicunque sub peccati jugo sunt, omnes diaboli servi sint, latum tamen est inter peccatorem et *energumenon* discrimen. In illum dæmon agit efficaciâ, ut sic dicam, *morali*, in hunc *physicâ* sive *naturali*. Illius animum objectis ad peccandum illecebris pervadit, hujus corpus et corporis sensus vel interiores vel etiam exteriores turbat: illum vitiis, hunc morbis subigit; denique illum volentem et consentientem, hunc invitum et repugnantem tenet ac, ut loquimur, possidet. Alia peccatori, alia energumeno comparata sunt remedia. Illius vitiis imbutus animus ratione, exhortatione, verbo denique evangelico curandus est, hujus corpus vi superiori et dono divinitus dato liberandum.

down the rightful lord from his seat; and he knows this; and out of his consciousness of it there goes forth from him a cry for redemption, so soon as ever a glimpse of hope is afforded, an unlooked-for Redeemer draws near. This sense of misery, this yearning after deliverance, is that, in fact, which constituted these demoniacs subjects for Christ's healing power. Without it they would have been as little subjects of this as the devils, in whom evil has had its perfect work, in whom there is nothing for the divine grace to take hold of;—so that in their case, as in every other, faith was the condition of healing. There was in them a spark of higher life, not yet trodden out; which, indeed, so long as they were alone, was but light enough to reveal to them their proper darkness; and which none but the very Lord of life could have fanned again into a flame. But He who came 'to destroy the works of the devil,' as He showed Himself lord over purely physical evil, a healer of the diseases of men, and lord no less over purely spiritual evil, a deliverer of men from their sins,—manifested Himself also lord in these complex cases partaking of the nature of either, ruler also in this border land, where these two regions of evil touch one another, and run so strangely and inexplicably one into the other.

Yet while thus 'men possessed with devils' is in no wise an expression equivalent to surpassingly wicked men, born of the serpent seed, of the devil's regeneration, and so become his children (Acts xiii. 10),—seeing that in such there is no cry for redemption, no desire after deliverance, it is more than probable that lavish sin, above all, indulgence in sensual lusts, superinducing, as it often would, a weakness of the nervous system, wherein is the especial band between body and soul, may have laid open these unhappy ones to the fearful incursions of the powers of darkness. They were greatly guilty, though not the guiltiest of all men. And this they felt, that by their own

act they had given themselves over to this tyranny of the devil, a tyranny from which, as far as their horizon reached, they could see no hope of deliverance,—that to themselves they owed that this hellish might was no longer *without* them, which being resisted would flee from them; but a power which now they could not resist, and which would not flee.

The phenomena exhibited by the demoniacs of Scripture, especially those of whom we are treating, entirely justify this view of the real presence of another will upon the will of the sufferer. They are not merely influences, which little by little have moulded and modified his will and brought it into subjection; but a power is there, which the man, at the very moment he is succumbing to it, feels to be the contradiction of his truest being; but which yet has forced itself upon him, and possessed him, that he must needs speak and act as its organ; however his personal consciousness may presently re-assert itself for a moment.[1] This, that they have not become indissolubly one, that the serpent and the man have not, as in

[1] In accesses of *delirium tremens*, the penalty of lavish indulgence in intoxicating drinks, we find something analogous to this double consciousness. The victim of this 'in his most tranquil and collected moments is not to be trusted; for the transition from that state to the greatest violence is instantaneous: he is often recalled by a word to an apparent state of reason, but as quickly his false impressions return; *there is sometimes evidence, at the time, of a state of double consciousness,* a condition of mind which is sometimes remembered by the patient when the paroxysm is over' (Bright and Addison, *On the Practice of Medicine*, vol. i. p. 262). Gfrörer, a German rationalist, is struck with a like phenomenon in others (*Das Heiligthum und die Wahrheit*, Stuttgart, 1838, p. 302): Auch scheue ich mich trotz allen Aufklärern nicht zu bemerken, dass neuerdings hier zu Lande gar seltsame Erscheinungen der Art beobachtet worden sind, und wenn ich recht unterrichtet bin, so hat die höchste ärztliche Behörde in Würtemberg, der solche Fälle vorgelegt wurden, dahin entschieden, dass es allerdings Krankheiten geben könne, durch welche zwei Bewusstseyn in dem Menschen entstehen, so zwar dass der Betroffene überzeugt ist, neben seinem Ich noch ein Anderes mit Gewalt eingedrungenes in sich zu haben. In a note he adds, Mein Gewährsmann ist, ausser mehreren Anderen, ein Mann, den ich genau kenne, von kaltem Verstande, unbefangen, wahrhaftig, ein mathematischer Kopf.

Dante's awful image, grown together, 'each melted into other,'[1] but that they still are twain; this is, indeed, the one circumstance of hope which survives amid the general wreck and ruin of the moral and spiritual life. Yet this, for the time being, gives the appearance, though a deceptive one, of a far completer overthrow of his inner life than manifests itself in wicked men, who have given themselves over wholly, without reserve and without reluctancy, to the working of iniquity. In these last, by the very completeness of their apostasy from the good, there is consistency at any rate; there are no merest incoherencies, no violent contradictions at every instant emerging in their words and in their conduct; they are at one with themselves. But all these incoherencies and self-contradictions we trace in the conduct of the demoniac; he rushes to the feet of Jesus, as coming to Him for aid, and then presently he deprecates his interference. There is not in him one vast contradiction to the true end of his being, consistently worked out, but a thousand lesser contradictions, in the midst of which the true idea of his life, not wholly obscured, will sometimes by fitful glimpses reappear. There is on his part an occasional reluctancy against this usurpation by another of his spirit's throne—a protest, which for the present, indeed, does but aggravate the confusion of his life—but which yet contains in it the pledge of a possible freedom, of a redemption whereof he may be a partaker still.

One objection to this view of the matter may be urged, namely, that if possession be anything more than insanity in some of its different forms, how comes it to pass that there are no demoniacs now, that these have wholly disappeared from among us? But the assumption that there are none now, itself demands to be proved. It is not hard to perceive why there should be few by comparison; why this form of spiritual evil should have lost much

[1] Dante, *Inferno*, xxv.

both in frequency and malignity, and from both these causes be far more difficult to recognize. For in the first place, if there was anything that marked the period of the coming of Christ, and that immediately succeeding, it was the wreck and confusion of men's spiritual life which was then, the sense of utter disharmony, the hopelessness, the despair which must have beset every man that thought at all,—this, with the tendency to rush with a frantic eagerness into sensual enjoyments as the refuge from these thoughts of despair. That whole period was 'the hour and power of darkness,' of a darkness which then, as just before the dawn of a new day, was the thickest. The world was again a chaos, and the creative words, 'Let there be light,' though just about to be spoken, were not uttered yet. It was exactly the crisis for such soul-maladies as these, in which the spiritual, psychical, and bodily should be thus strangely intermingled, and it is nothing wonderful that such should have abounded at that time; for the predominance of certain moral maladies at certain epochs of the world's history, specially fitted for their generation, with their gradual decline and total disappearance in other times less congenial to them, is a fact itself admitting no manner of question.[1]

Moreover we cannot doubt that the might of hell has been greatly broken by the coming of the Son of God in the flesh; and with this a restraint set on the grosser manifestations of its power; 'I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven' (Luke x. 18; cf. Rev. xx. 2). His rage

[1] All this has been well traced by Hecker, in three valuable treatises translated into English with this common title, *On the Epidemics of the Middle Ages*. In treating of the terrible Dancing Mania, he shows how there are centuries open to peculiar inflictions of these kinds; how they root themselves in a peculiar temperament which belongs to men's minds in those ages; and how when they disappear, or become rare and lose their intensity, their very existence is denied by the sceptical ignorance of a later age (pp. 87–152). Compare Delitzsch, *System of Biblical Psychology*, Engl. Transl. pp. 358–360. The whole chapter is full of interest.

and violence are continually hemmed in and hindered by the preaching of the Word and ministration of the Sacraments. It were another thing even now in a heathen land, above all in one where Satan was not left in undisputed possession, but wherein the great crisis of the conflict between light and darkness was beginning through the first proclaiming there of the Gospel of Christ. There we might expect to encounter, whether in the same intensity or not, manifestations analogous to these. Rhenius, a well-known Lutheran missionary in India, gives this as exactly his own experience,[1]—namely, that among the native Christians, even though many of them walk not as children of light, yet there is no such falling under Satanic influence in soul and body, as he traced frequently in the heathen around him; and he shows by a remarkable example, and one in which he is himself the witness throughout, how the assault in the name of Jesus on the kingdom of darkness, as it brings out all forms of devilish opposition into fiercest activity, so calls out the endeavour to counterwork the truth through men who have been made direct organs of the devilish will.

It may well be a question moreover, if an Apostle, or one gifted with Apostolic discernment of spirits, were to enter into a madhouse now, he might not recognize some of the sufferers there as 'possessed.' Certainly in many cases of mania and epilepsy there is a condition very analogous to that of the demoniacs. The fact that the sufferer, and commonly those around him, may apprehend it differently, is not of the essence of the matter; they will but reflect in this the popular impression of their time. Thus, no doubt, the Jews unreasonably multiplied the number of the possessed, including among cases of possession many slighter forms of disharmony in the inner life. The same mistake may very probably have

[1] In a letter of date March 27, 1818, printed in Von Meyer's *Blätter für höhere Wahrheit*, vol. vii. pp. 199-208.

been committed in the early Church, and many there, who had not fallen under this immediate tyranny of the devil, may yet have traced up their sufferings directly to him. Now, however, the popular feeling, which the unhappy man brings with him into his forlorn state, sets the opposite way, and in agreement with this fact is the language which he uses about himself, and others use about him. But the case immediately before us is one in which no question can exist, since the great Physician of souls Himself declares it one of a veritable possession, and treats it as such; and to this we will address ourselves now.

The connexion is very striking in which this miracle stands with that other which went immediately before. Our Lord has just shown Himself as the pacifier of the tumults and the discords in the outward world; He has spoken peace to the winds and to the waves, and hushed the war of elements with a word. But there is something wilder and more fearful than the winds and the waves in their fiercest moods—even the spirit of man, when it has broken loose from all restraints, and yielded itself to be his organ, who brings confusion and anarchy wherever his dominion reaches. And Christ will accomplish here a yet mightier work than that which He accomplished there; He will prove Himself here also the Prince of Peace, the restorer of the lost harmonies; He will speak, and at his potent word this madder strife, this blinder rage which is in the heart of man, will allay itself, and here also there shall be a great calm.

In seeking to combine the accounts given us of this memorable healing, a difficulty meets us at the outset,[1]

[1] There is another difficulty, namely, that, according at least to the received reading, St. Matthew lays the scene of the miracle in the country of the Gergesenes, St. Mark and St. Luke in that of the Gadarenes. But the MSS. in all three Evangelists vary between Γαδαρηνῶν, Γερασηνῶν, and Γεργεσηνῶν (see Tregelles, *On the Printed Text of*

this namely, that St. Matthew speaks of two demoniacs, while St. Mark and St. Luke only of one. Many reconciliations of their statements have been offered; as that one was a more notable person in the country than the other, which is Augustine's;[1] or that one was so much fiercer as to cause the other by most persons hardly to be taken note of, which is that of Maldonatus. However we

the Greek Testament, p. 192); so that it is impossible to say that there exists even a seeming contradiction here. Lachmann, for instance, finds none, who, certainly with no intention of excluding such, reads Γερασηνῶν throughout, which reading Origen found in most MSS. of his day; Fritzsche, in like manner, everywhere Γαδαρηνῶν, which Winer also prefers (*Realwörterbuch*, s. v. Gadara). This reading Origen states (*in Joh. tom.* vi. 24), was not in many MSS. of his time; yet is it almost certainly the right one; Griesbach, Scholz, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford having all adopted it; for Gadara, the capital city of Peræa, lay S.E. of the southern point of Gennesareth, at a distance of not more than sixty stadia from Tiberias, its country being called Γαδαρῖτις (see the *Dict. of the Bible*, s. v.). But Gerasa lay on the extreme eastern limit of Peræa (Josephus, *B. J.* iii. 3. 3; iv. 9. 1); so as sometimes to be numbered among the cities of Arabia, and much too distant to give its name to a district on the borders of the lake. Origen, therefore, from topographical motives, suggests Γεργεσηνῶν, a reading which apparently is a pure conjecture of his own, and which, till he gave it an impulse, had no place in any MSS. He does not see any reference here to the old Γεργεσαῖοι, one of the seven nations of Canaan (Deut. vii. 1), but to a city in that neighbourhood called Γέργεσα, whose existence he affirms; but of which in some earlier editions of this book I stated there exists no trace whatever; see, however, as slightly modifying this assertion, Dr. Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, part ii. ch. xxv., though his proofs are of the weakest. If there did lie any diversity of reading in the several Gospels at the first, it would probably be explained thus, that the limits of the territory, belonging to each city, were not very accurately determined, so that one Evangelist called it the country of one city, and one of another.

[1] Augustine (*De Cons. Evang.* ii. 24): Intelligas unum eorum fuisse personæ alicujus clarioris et famosioris, quem regio illa maxime dolebat; so Theophylact, that one was ἐπισημότερος, and Grotius. See another solution in Lightfoot, *Exercit. on St. Mark*, in loc. In the same way St. Matthew mentions two blind men (xx. 30), where the other Evangelists mention only one (Mark x. 46; Luke xviii. 35). It remained for one modern interpreter, Ammon (*Biblische Theologie*), to suggest that the two were a madman *and his keeper*! and for another (Holtzmann) to affirm that St. Matthew, having omitted to record the healing of the demoniac in the synagogue of Capernaum, here makes good the omission, by grouping him with the demoniac, of whom he has now to speak.

may account for it, one, it is evident, did fall into the background; and, therefore, following the later Evangelists, I shall speak in the main as they do, of the one demoniac who met the Lord as He came out of the ship; —not as though the other was not present: but these accounts, in which there appears but one, being those which, as the fullest, I desire mainly to follow, it would cause much embarrassment to use any other language.

The picture of the miserable man is fearful; and in drawing it each Evangelist has some touches peculiarly his own; but St. Mark's, as is his wont, is the most graphic of all, adding many strokes which wonderfully enhance the terribleness of the man's condition, and thus magnify the glory of his cure. He '*had his dwelling in the tombs*,' that is, in places unclean because of the dead men's bones which were there (Num. xix. 11, 16; Matt. xxiii. 27; Luke xi. 44). To those who did not therefore shun them, these tombs of the Jews afforded ample shelter (Isai. lxv. 4), being either natural caves, or recesses artificially hewn out of the rock, often so large as to be supported with columns, and with cells upon their sides for the reception of the dead. Being without the cities, and oftentimes in remote and solitary places, they would attract those who sought to avoid all fellowship with their kind.[1] Many such tombs may still be found in the immediate neighbourhood of Gadara.[2] This man was possessed of that extraordinary

[1] Hävernick, on Daniel iv. 33, quotes Ætius, *De Melancholiâ*, iii. 8; who says of the melancholy-mad, *οἱ πλείους ἐν σκοτείνοις τόποις χαίρουσι διατρίβειν, καὶ ἐν μνήμασι, καὶ ἐν ἐρήμοις.* And Warburton (*The Crescent and the Cross*, vol. ii. p. 352) remarkably illustrates this account: 'On descending from these heights [those of Lebanon], I found myself in *a cemetery*, whose sculptured turbans showed me that the neighbouring village was Moslem. The silence of the night was now broken *by fierce yells and howlings*, which I discovered proceeded from a *naked maniac*, who was fighting with some wild dogs for a bone. The moment he perceived me, he left his canine comrades, and bounding along with rapid strides, seized my horse's bridle, and almost forced him backward over the cliff, by the grip he held of the powerful Mameluke bit.'

[2] See Burckhardt, and, for the whole scenery of this miracle, Stanley.

muscular strength which maniacs so often put forth (cf. Acts xix. 16), and thus all efforts to bind and restrain him (and such had been often repeated) had proved ineffectual; '*no man could bind him, no not with chains*,' or more correctly, '*no not with a chain*;' so St. Mark v. 3. St. Matthew alone relates how he had made the way impassable for travellers; St. Luke alone that he was without clothing[1] (cf. 1 Sam. xix. 24; Dan. iv. 33), which, however, is assumed in St. Mark's statement that after he was healed he was found '*clothed, and in his right mind*,' sitting at Jesus' feet. Yet with all this, he was not so utterly lost, but that from time to time there woke up in him a sense of his misery, and of the frightful bondage under which he had come; although this could express itself only in his cries, and in a blind rage against himself as the true author of his woe; '*always day and night he was in the mountains and in the tombs, crying and cutting himself with stones*.'[2]

Sinai and Palestine, p. 372. 'The most interesting remains of Gadara,' says the *Dictionary of the Bible*, s. v., 'are its tombs, which dot the cliff for a considerable distance round the city. They are excavated in the limestone rock, and consist of chambers of various dimensions, some more than twenty feet square, with recesses in the sides for bodies. The doors are slabs of stone, a few being ornamented with panels; some of them still remain in their places. The present inhabitants of Um Keis [the old Gadara] are all troglodytes, "dwelling in tombs," like the poor maniacs of old.'

[1] Prichard (*On Insanity*, p. 26) quotes from an Italian physician's description of raving madness or mania: 'A striking and characteristic circumstance is the propensity to go quite naked. The patient tears his clothes to tatters;' and presently, in exact accordance with the description we have here: 'Notwithstanding his constant exertion of mind and body, the muscular strength of the patient seems daily to increase. He is able to break the strongest bonds, and even chains.'

[2] Prichard (*ibid.* p. 113), describing a case of raving mania: 'He habitually wounded his hands, wrists, and arms, with needles and pins; . . . the blood sometimes flowed copiously, dropping from his elbows when his arms were bare.' Altogether we have here a fearful commentary on the words of St. Peter, who describes such as this man as being *καταδυναστευομένους ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου* (Acts x. 38). An apocryphal allusion to this miracle adds one circumstance more,—that they gnawed their own flesh: *σαρκοφαγοῦντας τῶν ἰδίων μελῶν* (Thilo, *Cod. Apocryph.* vol. i. p. 808).

From such a one as this the Lord received his first greeting on those shores which his feet now probably for the first time were treading. This man with his companion starting from their dwelling-place in the tombs, rushed down to encounter, it may have been with hostile violence, the intruders who had dared to set foot on their domain. Or possibly they were at once drawn to Christ by the secret instinctive feeling that He was their helper, and repelled from Him by the sense of the awful gulf that divided them from Him, the Holy One of God. At any rate, if it *was* with purposes of violence, ere the man reached Him his mind was changed; '*for He had commanded the unclean spirit to come out of the man*' (Luke viii. 29), and the unclean spirit had recognized one that had a right to command; against whom force would avail nothing; and, like others on similar occasions, sought by a strong adjuration to avert his coming doom. He '*came and worshipped Him, and cried with a loud voice, What have I to do with Thee, Jesus, Thou Son of the most high God?*' (cf. Luke iv. 34, 41; Acts xvi. 17.) '*I adjure Thee by God that Thou torment me not.*'[1] Herein the true devilish spirit speaks out, which counts it a torment not to be suffered to torment others, and an injury done to itself when it is no longer permitted to be injurious to others. In St. Matthew they say,

[1] Baur (*Apollonius von Tyana und Christus*, p. 145) notes the remarkable resemblance which the narrative in the *Life of Apollonius* (iv. 25) of the demon which sought vainly to avert its doom, and at length yielded to the threatening words of Apollonius, and abandoned the young man of Corcyra, has with the present. This resemblance extends to the very words. As the possessed exclaims here, Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοὶ, Ἰησοῦ, υἱὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑψιστοῦ; δέομαί σου, μή με βασανίσῃς, so there of the Lamia it is said, δακρύοντι ἐῴκει τὸ φάσμα, καὶ ἐδεῖτο μὴ βασανίζειν αὐτὸ μηδὲ ἀναγκάζειν ὁμολογεῖν, ὅ, τι εἴη. Baur does not doubt that that narrative was fashioned in imitation of this. Another expulsion of a demon (iv. 20) has even more notable points of likeness; and he might have referred to a third (iii. 38), in which many features of the father's intercession for his lunatic son (Matt. xvii. 15, 16), and of the Syropœnician mother for her daughter (Matt. xv. 22), appear curiously blended together.

'*Art Thou come hither to torment us before the time?*' so that, by their own confession, a time is coming, an inevitable hour, when there shall be an entire victory of the kingdom of light over that of darkness, and when all which belong unto the latter shall be shut up in the abyss (Rev. xx. 10), and all power of harming withdrawn from them for ever. All Scripture agrees with this, that the judgment of the angels is yet to come (1 Cor. vi. 3); they are 'reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day' (Jude 6); and what the unclean spirits deprecate here, is the bringing in, by anticipation, of that final doom.

The first bidding of Christ is not immediately obeyed;—the unclean spirits remonstrate, do not at once abandon their prey. No doubt He could have compelled them to this, had He pleased; but the man might have perished in the process (cf. Mark ix. 26). Even that first bidding had induced a terrible paroxysm. It was then of Christ's own will, of the Physician wise and tender as He was strong, to proceed step by step. And, first, He demands of him his name,—some say, to magnify the greatness of the deliverance and the Deliverer, by showing, through the answer, the power and malignity of the foe that should be overcome. But, more probably, the question was addressed *to the man*. It should calm him, by bringing him to recollection, to the consciousness of his personality, of which a man's name is the outward expression,—that he was a person, having once been apart from, and not even now inextricably bound up with, those spiritual wickednesses which had dominion over him. The question may thus have been intended to facilitate his cure.[1] But if so meant, either the evil spirit snatches at the answer and

[1] In cases of somnambulism, which must be regarded as a disorder, though in a milder form, of the spiritual life, the sleep-walker, when everything else fails, may often be awakened and recalled to a healthy state of consciousness through being addressed by his name (Schubert, *Krankheiten und Störungen der menschl. Seele*, p. 368).

replies for himself, or the unhappy man, instead of recurring to his true name, that which should remind him of what he was before he fell under this thraldom, declares his sense of the utter ruin of his whole moral and spiritual being. In his reply, '*My name is Legion, for we are many*,' truth and error are fearfully blended. Not on one side only, but on every side, the walls of his spirit have been broken down; and he laid open to all the incursions of evil, torn asunder in infinite ways, now under one hostile and hated power, now under another. They who dominate his life are 'lords many.' Only by an image drawn from the reminiscences of his former life can he express his sense of his own condition. He had seen the serried ranks of a Roman legion, that sign of terror and fear, before which the world had quailed; which had shown itself more than a match for the fierce and fanatic courage of the Jew. Even such, at once one and many, cruel and inexorable and strong, were the powers that were tyrannizing over him.[1] When it is said of Mary Magdalene, that out of her had gone *seven* devils (Luke viii. 2), something of the same truth is expressed,—that her spiritual life was laid waste, not on one side only, but on many (cf. Matt. xii. 45).

And then again, with that interchange of persons which was continually going forward, that quick shifting, so to speak, of the polarity, so that at one moment the human consciousness became the positive, at another the negative pole, the unclean spirit, or rather the man become now his organ, speaks out anew, entreating not to be sent into

[1] See Olshausen, *Commentary*, in loc.; Meyer: Die dämonische Potenz in diesem Kranken ist als ein zur Einheit verbundener Complex sehr vieler dämonischer Individualitäten dargestellt, welche sich erst beim Ausfahren trennen, und in die Körper der Schweine vertheilen. Die fixe Idee des Menschen von dieser Viel-Einheit der ihn besitzenden dämonischen Potenz hatte ihm auch den Namen der letztern: Legion (das Wort ist auch im Rabbinischen gebräuchlich) suggerirt,—ein Name, welcher, vom römischen Militär entlehnt, der Paradoxie der verrückten Einbildungskraft entsprechend ist.

'*the deep*,' or as it would be better '*the abyss*'[1] (Luke viii. 31), or, clothing his petition in the form of a notion which belonged to the man whom he possessed, '*that He would not send them away out of the country*' (Mark v. 10). The request is in both cases the same; for, according to Jewish notions, certain countries being assigned to evil as well as to good spirits, whose limits they were unable to overpass, to be sent out of their own country, no other being open to them, implied being sent into '*the abyss*,' or bottomless pit, since that remains for them alone.

Hereupon follows a circumstance which has ever proved one of the chief stumbling-blocks offered by the Evangelical history. The devils, if they must leave their more welcome habitation, the heart of man, if indeed the Stronger is come, spoiling the strong man's good, taking his thralls out of his power, yet entreat, in their inextinguishable desire of harming, or out of those mysterious affinities which continually reveal themselves between the demoniacal and the bestial,[2] to be allowed to enter into the swine;—of which a large herd,—St. Mark with his usual punctuality notes that they were '*about two thousand*,'—were feeding on the neighbouring cliffs. But to the evil

[1] Εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον,—our Version leaves room for a confusion with what follows, where the swine under their influence rush down 'into *the sea*.' Wiclif better, 'Thei preieden hym that he schulde not comande hem that they schulden go *in to hell*.' With a like liability to confusion ἄβυσσος is translated '*the deep*,' Rom. x. 7, where also 'hell,' meaning by that word Hades in its most comprehensive sense, as including the gathering-place of all the departed, and not the φυλακή, or prison-house of evil spirits alone, would have been better. Besides these two places, the word only occurs in the Apocalypse, but there several times, as ix. 1, 2, 11; xi. 7; xvii. 8; xx. 1, 3, where it plainly means the τάρταρος (2 Pet. ii. 4) = γέεννα. It is properly an adjective from βυσσός, the Ionic form of βυθός: so Euripides, Ταρτάρου ἄβυσσα χάσματα (*Phœnissæ*, 1632).

[2] Of which last the swine (amica luto sus) may be taken for the fittest exponents, as is witnessed in the ethical language of many nations; in the Latin, for example, where *spurcus* is in close connexion with *porcus* (Döderlein, *Lat. Synon.* vol. ii. p. 55), and in the French *cochonnerie*.

all things turn to evil. God's saints and servants appear *not* to be heard; and the very refusal of their requests is to them a blessing (2 Cor. xii. 8, 9). The wicked, Satan (Job i. 11) and his ministers, are sometimes heard, and the very granting of their petitions issues in their worst confusion and loss[1] (Num. xxii. 20; Ps. lxxviii. 29, 31). So is it now: the prayer of these evil spirits was heard; but only to their ruin. They are allowed to enter into the swine; but the destruction of the whole herd follows; and that which they most dreaded came upon them; no longer finding organs in or through which to work, they are driven perforce to that very prison-house which they most would have shunned.[2]

The first cavil which has been raised here is this—What right had the Lord to inflict this loss on the owners of the swine?—being the same which has been raised on occasion of the cursing of the barren fig-tree (Matt. xxi. 19). It might be sufficient to answer to this, that Christ did not send the devils into the swine; He merely drove them out from the man; all beyond this was merely permissive.[3] But supposing that He had done so, a man is of more value than many swine; and if this granting of the evil spirits' request helped the cure of this sufferer, caused them to relax their hold on him more easily, mitigated the paroxysm of their going forth (cf. Mark ix. 26), this would have been motive enough for allowing them to perish. It may have been necessary for the permanent healing of the man that he should have this outward evidence and testimony that the hellish powers which held him in bondage

[1] See Augustine's excellent words, *in Ep. Joh. tract.* vi. 7, 8.

[2] For the exact spot which was the scene of this catastrophe see Konrad Furrer, *Die Bedeutung der Bibl. Geographie*, p. 19. 'These creatures,' says Dr. Thomson (*The Land and the Book*, p. 378), 'still abound at this place, and in a state as wild and fierce as though they were still possessed.'

[3] Augustine: Expulsa et in porcos *permissa* dæmonia; and Aquinas; Quod autem porci in mare præcipitati sunt, non fuit operatio divini miraculi, sed operatio dæmonum e permissione divinâ.

for so long had quitted their hold. He may have needed to have his deliverance sealed and realized to him in the open destruction of his enemies; not otherwise to be persuaded that Christ had indeed and for ever set him free; as Israel, coming out of Egypt, must see the Egyptians dead upon the sea-shore before they could indeed believe that the rod of their oppressors had been broken for ever (Exod. xiv. 30).[1]

But setting aside all apologies, on what ground, it may be asked, is this which the Lord here wrought, made more the subject of cavil than any other loss inflicted upon men by Him from whom all things come, and who therefore can give or take away according to the good pleasure of his will? Men might object with as good a right against the murrain which causes cattle to die, the inundation which destroys the fruits of the field, or any other natural calamity wherewith God chastens his children, punishes, or seeks to make contrite the hearts of his enemies; for oftentimes his taking away is in a higher sense a giving; a withdrawing of the meaner thing, to make receptive of the better. Thus might it well have been intended here, however the sin of these Gadarenes hindered the gracious design. If the swine belonged to Jewish owners, and we know from Josephus that there were numbers of hellenizing Jews just in these parts, there may have been in this loss a punishment meant for them who from motives of gain showed themselves despisers of Moses' law.[2] It must be owned, however, that the population of the Decapolis was predominantly Gentile; Josephus calls Gadara itself a Greek city.[3]

But the narrative is charged with contradictions and

[1] Godet: Il fallait un signe décisif dans lequel éclatât la réalité du départ de la puissance malfaisante, pour amener le possédé à la pleine certitude de sa délivrance.

[2] See Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum*, vol. i. p. 704.

[3] *Antt.* xvii. 11. 4.

absurdities. The unclean spirits ask permission to enter into the swine; yet no sooner have they thus done than they defeat their own purpose, destroying that animal life, from which if they be altogether driven they must betake them to the more detested place of their punishment. It is nowhere, however, said that they *drove* the swine down the steep place into the sea. It is just as easy, and much more natural, to suppose that against *their* will the swine, when they found themselves seized by this new and strange power, rushed themselves in wild and panic fear to their destruction,—the foremost plunging headlong down the cliffs, and the rest blindly following. But in either case, whether they thus destroyed themselves, or were impelled by the foul spirits, there reveals itself here the very essence and truest character of evil, which evermore outwits and defeats itself, being as inevitably scourged in the granting of its requests as in their refusal; which, stupid, blind, self-contradicting, and suicidal, can only destroy, and will involve itself in the common ruin rather than not destroy. And what, if in the fierce hatred of these foul spirits of darkness against the Prince of light and life, they may have been willing to bring any harm on themselves, if only they might so bring on Him the ill-will of men, and thus traverse and hinder his blessed work? And this, no doubt, they did effectually here; for it was fear of further losses, and alienation from Christ on account of those by his presence already entailed upon them, which moved the people of the country to urge Him that He would leave their coasts.

But the point of most real difficulty is the *entering* of the devils into the swine,—the working, that is, of the spiritual life on the bestial, which seems altogether irreceptive of it, and to possess no organs through which it could operate. I put aside of course here, as both in themselves merely ridiculous, and irreconcilable with the

documents as they lie before us, the solutions of Paulus and his compeers, that the demoniac, in the parting paroxysm of his madness, hunted the creatures over the precipices into the lake, or that, while the swineherds were drawn by curiosity to watch the encounter between Christ and the demoniac, or had gone to warn Him of the danger of meeting the madman, the untended herd fell a fighting, and so tumbled headlong over the cliffs. Whatever difficulties this miracle may present, they certainly are not by shifts such as these to be evaded; and their perplexity at any rate claims to be respectfully treated, who find it hard to reconcile this fact with what else they have been taught to hold fast as most precious concerning the specific difference between man with the whole order of spiritual existences on the one side, and the animal creation on the other. I will only suggest that perhaps we make to ourselves a difficulty here, too easily assuming that the lower animal world is wholly shut up in itself, and incapable of receiving impressions from that which is above it. The assumption is one unwarranted by deeper investigations, which lead rather to an opposite conclusion,—not to a breaking down of the boundaries between the two worlds, but to the showing in what wonderful ways the lower is receptive of impressions from the higher, both for good and for evil.[1] Nor does this working of the

[1] Kieser, who certainly would not go out of his way to bring his theory into harmony with Scripture facts, distinctly recognizes (*Tellurismus*, vol. ii. p. 72), with reference to this present miracle, the possibility of the passing over of demoniac conditions upon others, and even upon animals (die Möglichkeit eines Uebergangs dämonischer Zustände auf Andere, und selbst auf Thiere). How remarkable in this respect are well-authenticated cases of *clairvoyance*, in which the horse is evidently by its terror, extreme agitation, and utter refusal to advance, a partaker of the vision of its rider (see Passavant, *Unters. über d. Hellsehen*, p. 316; Scheitlin, *Thierseelenkunde*, vol. ii. p. 486). And indeed in our common life the horse, and the dog no less, are eminently receptive of the spiritual conditions of their appointed lord and master, Man. With what electric swiftness does the courage or fear of the rider pass into the horse; and so too the gladness or depression of its master is almost instantaneously

spiritual on the physical life stand isolated in this single passage of Scripture, but we are taught the same lesson throughout (Gen. iii. 17; Rom. viii. 22).

There are, if I mistake not, two stages of feeling in regard of their divine Visitor which the people of the country of the Gadarenes pass through; the second of these much less favourable than the first. It is easy to overlook these; but when attention is called to this point, they are evident enough, both in the third Gospel and still more so in the second. In the last we read how '*they that fed the swine fled and told it in the city and in the country. And they went out to see what it was that was done*,' and seeing the healed man, '*they were afraid*.' The first impression which the miracle and the sight of the restored demoniac make upon them is one of fear; but this fear was a very common accompaniment of the strange and mighty works which Jesus did, and as an introduction to better things by no means in itself to be deprecated. Presently, however, the story of what had befallen the possessed is told over again by the eye-witnesses of it, '*and also concerning the swine*'—this last apparently for the first time. But with this knowledge of the means by which the man was healed, the whole attitude of the people to his Healer is altered. '*They began to pray Him*'—so they had not prayed Him before—'*to depart out of their coasts*.' This entreaty of the Gadarenes we may compare, in the way of contrast, with that of the Samaritans (John iv. 40). To suppose that it had, as Jerome suggests, its root in their humility, that it is a parallel to St. Peter's 'Depart from me, for I am a sinful man' (Luke v. 8), is an entire missing of its meaning. It was provoked rather by the

reflected and reproduced in his faithful dog. It is true that we might expect, as we should find, far less of this in the grosser nature of the swine than in those creatures of nobler kinds. Yet the very fierceness and grossness of these animals may have been exactly that which best fitted them for receiving such impulses from the lower world as those under which they perished.

injury which already from his brief presence among them had ensued, with a fear of greater losses which might follow. This was their time of trial. It should now be seen whether the kingdom of heaven was first in their esteem; whether they would hold all else as cheap by comparison; so that in this aspect the destruction of the swine had in regard of them an ethical purpose and aim. Under this trial they failed. It was nothing to them that a man, probably a fellow-citizen, was delivered from that terrible bondage, that they saw him '*sitting at the feet of Jesus*' (Luke x. 39; Acts xxii. 3), '*clothed, and in his right mind.*'[1] The breach in their worldly estate alone occupied their thoughts. For spiritual blessings brought near to them they cared nothing at all; and '*they were afraid,*' being ignorant what next might follow. They felt the presence of God's Holy One intolerable to them; that to them, remaining in their sins, it could only bring mischiefs, of which they had made the first experience already. And having no desire to be delivered from their sins, they entreated Him to go; they 'said to God, Depart from us; and what can the Almighty do for them?' (Job xxii. 17). And *their* prayer also was heard (Ps. lxxviii. 29–31); for God sometimes hears his enemies in anger (Num. xxii. 20), even as He refuses to hear his friends in love (2 Cor. xii. 8, 9). He did depart; He took them at their word, and let them alone[2] (cf. Exod. x. 28, 29), as they desired.

[1] Augustine (*Quæst. Evang.* ii. qu. 13): Significat multitudinem vetustâ suâ vitâ delectatam, honorare quidem, sed nolle pati, Christianam legem, dum dicunt quod eam implere non possint, admirantes tamen fidelem populum a pristinâ perditâ conversatione sanatum. The name *Gergeseni* has been often since given to those who will not endure sound doctrine (Erasmus, *Adagia*, p. 313).

[2] Augustine (*Enarr. in Ps.* cxxxvi. 3) has a noble passage on what the world calls prosperity; which when Christ interrupts, then the world counts that He has brought nothing good, and would fain have Him depart from it, if it might: Vides enim si theatra et amphitheatra et circi starent incolumes, si nihil caderet de Babyloniâ, si ubertas esset circumfluentium voluptatum hominibus cantaturis et saltaturis ad turpia cantica,

But the healed would fain have accompanied his Healer: and '*when He was come into the ship, prayed Him that he might be with Him.*' Was it that he feared, as Theophylact supposes, lest in the absence of his Deliverer the spirits of the pit should resume their dominion over him, and nowhere felt safe but in immediate nearness to Him?—or did he only desire, out of the depth of his gratitude, henceforth to be a follower of Him to whom he owed this mighty deliverance? Whatever was his motive, the Lord had other purposes with him. He was Himself quitting those who had shown themselves so unworthy of his presence; but He would not leave Himself without a witness among them. The man, so wonderfully delivered from the worst bondage of the Evil One, should be to them a standing monument of God's grace and power, an evidence that He would have delivered them, and was willing to heal them still, from all the diseases of their souls: '*Jesus suffered him not, but saith unto him, Go home to thy friends, and tell them how great things the Lord hath done for thee, and hath had compassion on thee.*'[1] And the man did so, and not without effect: '*he departed, and began to publish in Decapolis how great things Jesus had done for him; and all men did marvel.*'[2]

si libido scortantium et meretricantium haberet quietem et securitatem, si non timeret famem in domo suâ qui clamat ut pantomimi vestiantur, si hæc omnia sine labe, sine perturbatione aliquâ fluerent, et esset securitas magna nugarum, felicia essent tempora, et magnam felicitatem rebus humanis Christus adtulisset. Quia vero cæduntur iniquitates, ut exstirpatâ cupiditate plantetur caritas Jerusalem, quia miscentur amaritudines vitæ temporali, ut æterna desideretur, quia erudiuntur in flagellis homines, paternam accipientes disciplinam, ne judiciariam inveniant sententiam; nihil boni adtulit Christus, et labores adtulit Christus.

[1] Erasmus rightly connects ὅσα not alone with πεποίηκεν, but also with ἠλέησεν—of course, in the second case, adverbially: Et *quantopere* misertus sit tui. It is true that we should rather expect in such a case to have the ὅσα repeated: but there are abundant examples to justify the omission.

[2] Augustine (*Quæst. Evang.* ii. 13): Ut sic quisque intelligat post remissionem peccatorum redeundum sibi esse in conscientiam bonam, et serviendum Evangelio propter aliorum etiam salutem, ut deinde cum

Yet this command that he should go and declare the great things done for him, may very well have found its further motive in the special moral condition of the man. Only by a reference to this moral condition are we able to account for the apparently contradictory injunctions which the Lord laid on those whom He had healed:—some being forbidden to say anything of God's goodness to them (Matt. viii. 4; Luke viii. 56),—this one commanded to publish everywhere the mercy which he had received. We may very well suppose that where there was danger of all deeper impressions being scattered and lost through a garrulous repetition of the outward circumstances of the healing, silence was enjoined, that so there might be an inward brooding over the gracious and wondrous dealings of the Lord. But where, on the contrary, there was a temperament over-inclined to melancholy, sunken and shut up in itself, a sufferer needing to be drawn out from self, and into healthy communion with his kind,—as was evidently the case with such a solitary melancholic sufferer as is here before us,—there the command was, that the man should go and tell to others the great things which God had done for him, and by the very act of this telling maintain the healthy condition of his own soul.[1]

Christo requiescat; ne cum præpropere jam vult esse cum Christo, negligat ministerium prædicationis, fraternæ redemptioni accommodatum. He makes in the same place this whole account an historico-prophetic delineation of the exorcizing, so to speak, of the heathen world of its foul superstitions and devilish idolatries.

[1] See what Martensee has written on demoniacal possession in his *Christ. Dogmatik*, § 103.

6. *THE RAISING OF JAIRUS' DAUGHTER.*

Matt. ix. 18, 19, 23–26; Mark v. 22, 24, 35–43; Luke viii. 41, 42, 49–56.

THIS miracle is by St. Mark and St. Luke made immediately to follow our Lord's return from that eastern side of the lake, which He had quitted when the inhabitants, guiltily at strife with their own good, had besought Him to depart out of their coasts (Matt. viii. 34). By St. Matthew other events, the curing of the paralytic, his own calling, and some discourses with the Pharisees, are inserted between. Yet of these only the latter (ix. 10–17) the best harmonists find really to have here their proper place. '*While He spake these things unto them, behold, there came a certain ruler, and worshipped Him.*' The two later Evangelists record his name, '*Jairus*,'[1] and more accurately define his office; he was '*one of the rulers of the synagogue*,'[2] all which St. Matthew, who has his eye only on the main fact, and to whom all its accessories seem indifferent, passes over. The synagogue, we can hardly doubt, was that of Capernaum, where now Jesus was (Matt.

[1] A hellenized form of Jair (see Num. xxxii. 41; Deut. iii. 14). One of this name had in the old times done exploits, and was commemorated for them.

[2] In Matthew simply *ἄρχων*, which is explained in Mark *εἷς τῶν ἀρχισυναγώγων*, in Luke *ἄρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς*. Many synagogues had but one of these (Luke xiii. 14), the name itself indicating as much; yet it is plain from this and other passages, as Acts xiii. 15, that a synagogue often had many of these '*rulers*.' Probably those described as *τοὺς ὄντας τῶν Ἰουδαίων πρώτους*, whom St. Paul summoned at Rome (Acts xxviii. 17), were such 'chiefs of the synagogue' (see Vitringa, *De Synagogâ*, p. 584, sqq.).

ix. 1); the man therefore most probably made afterwards a part of that deputation which came to the Lord pleading for the heathen centurion (Luke vii. 3); 'the elders of the Jews' there being identical with the '*rulers of the synagogue*' here. In any case it is a remarkable token of the honour in which the Lord was at this time held by some who stood high among the rulers of the people, that one of these should come worshipping, doing, that is, reverent homage to Him, and seeking from Him so mighty a boon as that which this one sought at his hands. For he who may have pleaded then for another, presents himself now pleading for his own; comes to Him, saying, '*My daughter is even now dead; but come and lay thy hand upon her, and she shall live.*' Thus St. Matthew; but the other Evangelists with an important variation: '*My little daughter lieth at the point of death*'[1] (Mark v. 23): '*He had one only daughter, about twelve years of age, and she lay a dying*' (Luke viii. 42). This, which the after history shows to have been more exactly the fact, is not hard to reconcile with the statement in St. Matthew. When the father left his child, she was at the latest gasp; he knew not whether to regard her now as alive or dead; he only knew that life was ebbing so fast when he quitted her side, that she could scarcely be living still;[2] and yet, having no certain notices of her death, he was perplexed whether to speak of her as departed or not, and thus at one moment would

[1] Ἐσχάτως ἔχειν = in extremis esse; one of the frequent Latinisms of St. Mark; which do something to corroborate the old tradition that this Gospel was written originally at Rome, and for Roman readers. So ἱκανὸν ποιῆσαι = satisfacere (xv. 15), σπεκουλάτωρ (vi. 27), φραγελλόω (xv. 15), λεγεών (v. 9, 15), πραιτώριον (xv. 16), κῆνσος (xii. 14), κεντυρίων (xv. 39), κοδράντης (xii. 42), δηνάριον (vi. 37; xiv. 5), ξέστης (vii. 4, 8), and others. The use of diminutives, such as the θυγάτριον here, is also characteristic of this Evangelist; thus κοράσιον (v. 41), κυνάρια (vii. 27), ἰχθύδια (viii. 7), ὠτάριον (xiv. 47).

[2] Bengel: Ita dixit ex conjecturâ. Augustine (*De Cons. Evang.* ii. 28): Ita enim desperaverat, ut potius eam vellet reviviscere, non credens vivam posse inveniri, quam morientem reliquerat. But Theophylact, not, I think, rightly: Ἦν αὐξάνων τὴν συμφοράν, ὡς εἰς ἔλεον ἑλκύσαι τὸν Χριστόν.

express himself in one language, at the next in another. Strange that a circumstance like this, so drawn from the life, so testifying to the reality of the things recorded, should be urged by some as a contradiction between one Gospel and another!

That Lord upon whose ear the tidings of woe might never fall in vain, at once '*arose*,'—from the feast, some will have it, which Levi had prepared for Him, but this seems more than necessarily lies in the word—'*and followed him, and so did his disciples.*' The crowd which had been listening to his teaching, followed also, curious and eager to see what the Lord would do or would fail to do. The miracle of the healing of the woman with an issue of blood took place upon the way, but will be better treated apart; being, as it is, entirely separable from this history, though not without its moral bearing upon it; for the delay of which her act was the occasion must have sorely tried the agonized father, when death was now shaking the last few sands in the hour-glass of his daughter's life, and every moment was precious. It was a trial similar in kind to that wherewith the sisters of Bethany were tried, when they watched the fast-ebbing life of a brother, and He who alone could have helped tarried at a distance notwithstanding. But sore as the trial must have been, we detect no signs of impatience on his part, and this no doubt was laid to his account. While the Lord was yet speaking to the woman, '*there came from the ruler of the synagogue's house certain which said, Thy daughter is dead: why troublest*[1] *thou the Master any further?*' St. Luke mentions but one, probably the especial bearer of the message, whom others went along with, as it is

[1] Σκύλλω, properly to flay, as σκῦλα are originally the spoils, dress, or armour, stripped from the bodies of the slain; afterwards more generally, fatigare, vexare, and often with a special reference to fatiguing through the length of a journey (we should read ἐσκυλμένοι, not ἐκλελυμένοι, Matt. ix. 36); as is the meaning here: 'Why dost thou weary the Master with this tedious way?' (see Suicer, *Thes.* s. v.).

common for men in their thirst for excitement to have a kind of pleasure in being the bearers even of evil tidings. What hope of effectual help from Christ they may before have entertained, had now perished. They who, perhaps, had faith enough to believe that He could fan the last expiring spark of life into a flame, yet had not the stronger faith to anticipate the harder thing, that He could rekindle that spark of life, after it had been quenched altogether. Perhaps the father's hope would have perished too, and no room have been left for this miracle, faith, the necessary condition, being wanting, if a gracious Lord had not seen the danger, and prevented his rising unbelief. '*As soon as Jesus heard the word that was spoken, He saith unto the ruler of the synagogue, Be not afraid, only believe.*' There is something very gracious in that '*as soon.*' The Lord spake upon the instant, not leaving any time for a thought of unbelief to insinuate itself into the father's mind, much less to utter itself from his lips, such as might have altogether stood in the way of a cure, but preoccupying him at once with words of encouragement and hope.[1]

And now He takes with Him three of his Apostles, Peter and James and John, the same three who were allowed, on more than one later occasion, to be witnesses of things withdrawn from the others. We read here for the first time of such an election within the election;[2] and the fact of such now finding place would mark, especially when we remember the solemn significance of the other seasons of a like selection (Matt. xvii. 1, 2; xxvi. 37), that this was a new era in the life of the Lord. The work on which He was entering now was so strange and so mysterious that none but these, the flower and crown of the apostolic band, were its fitting witnesses. The

[1] Titus Bostrensis (in Cramer, *Cat. in Luc.*): Ἵνα γὰρ μὴ εἴπῃ καὶ αὐτός, Ἐπίσχες, οὐ χρείαν σου ἔχω, Κύριε, ἤδη γέγονε τὸ πέρας, ἀπέθανεν, ἣν προσεδοκῶμεν ὑγιαίνειν (ἄπιστος γὰρ ἦν, Ἰουδαϊκὸν ἔχων φρόνημα), φθάνει ὁ Κύριος καί φησι, Μὴ φοβοῦ, παῦσον τῆς ἀπιστίας τὰ ῥήματα.

[2] Ἐκλεκτῶν ἐκλεκτότεροι, as Clement of Alexandria calls them.

parents were present for reasons altogether different. With those, and these, and none other, '*He cometh to the house of the ruler of the synagogue, and seeth the tumult, and them that wept and wailed greatly*,' as St. Mark, or '*the minstrels and the people making a noise*,' as St. Matthew, has it. There, as everywhere else, He appears calming and pacifying: '*He saith unto them, Why make ye this ado, and weep? the damsel is not dead, but sleepeth. And they laughed Him to scorn;*' St. Luke alone adds the important words, '*knowing that she was dead*,' which to my mind are quite decisive as to what the *intention* of the sacred writer was—namely to record a quickening from the dead, and not the recovery from a swoon.

Some, indeed, and those not unbelievers, nor yet timid half-believers, such as have come to regard miracles as so much perilous ware, from which it is always an advantage when the Gospels can be a little lightened,—Olshausen, for instance,[1] who has manifested no wish elsewhere to explain away the wonderful works of our Lord,—have yet considered his words, common to all the Evangelists, '*The maid is not dead, but sleepeth*,' so explicit, as to leave them no choice but to refuse to number this among the actual raisings from the dead. They account it only a raising from a death-like swoon; though possibly a swoon from which the maiden would never have been recalled but for that life-giving touch and voice. Had this, however, been

[1] Origen (*Con. Cels.* ii. 48) has, I think, the same view of this miracle. He is observing on the absence of all *prodigality* in the miracles, and notes that we have but three raisings from the dead in all; mentioning this first of Jairus' daughter, he adds, περὶ ἧς οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως εἶπεν, Οὐκ ἀπέθανεν, ἀλλὰ καθεύδει· λέγων τι περὶ αὐτῆς ὃ οὐ πᾶσι τοῖς ἀποθανοῦσι προσῆν, but he does not express himself very plainly. But when all ancient and modern interpreters who take this view of the matter are mustered, it is enormous exaggeration, that I do not call it a falsification of facts, to say, as one has said lately, 'The raising of Jairus' daughter has long been abandoned as a case of restoration to life by all critics and theologians, except the few who still persist in ignoring the distinct and positive declaration of Jesus, *The damsel is not dead, but sleepeth*' (*Supernatural Religion*, vol. i. p. 168).

the case, Christ's word of encouragement to the father, when the tidings came that the spirit of his child was actually fled, would have certainly been different from that which actually it was. He might have bidden the father to dismiss his fear, for *He*, who knew all, knew that there was yet life in the child. But that '*Be not afraid, only believe*,' points another way; it is an evident summoning him to a trust in the almightiness of Him, to whose help he had appealed. Then too Christ uses exactly the same language concerning Lazarus, 'Our friend Lazarus sleepeth' (John xi. 11), which He uses about this maiden; and we know that He spoke there not of a death-like swoon, but of death. When to this obvious objection Olshausen replies, that Christ explains there distinctly that He meant the sleep of death, adding presently, 'Lazarus is dead,' it is enough to answer that He only does so after his disciples have misapprehended his words: He would have left those words as He had spoken them, but for their error in supposing that He had spoken of natural sleep; it was only then that He exchanged 'Our friend Lazarus sleepeth' for 'Lazarus is dead.' But as Lazarus did but sleep, because Jesus was about to 'awake him out of sleep,' so was this maiden only sleeping because her awakening in like manner was so near.[1] Besides this, to speak of death as a sleep, is an image common to all languages and nations. Thereby the reality of the death is not denied, but only the fact implicitly assumed, that death will be followed by a resurrection, as sleep is by an awakening. Nor is it hard to perceive why the Lord should use this language here. First, for the father's sake. The words are for the establishing of his trembling faith, which at

[1] Fritzsche: Puellam ne pro mortuâ habetote, sed dormire existimate, quippe in vitam mox redituram. Bengel: Puella, ob resuscitationem mox futuram, et celeriter et certo et facile, non erat annumeranda mortuis olim resurrecturis, sed dormientibus. Godet still better: Jésus veut dire que dans l'ordre de choses auquel il préside, la mort n'est plus la mort, mais prend le caractère d'un assoupissement momentané.

the spectacle of all these signs of mourning, of these evidences that all was finished, might easily have given way altogether; they are a saying over again, '*Be not afraid, only believe.*' He, the Lord of life, takes away that word of fear, '*She is dead,*' and substitutes that milder word which contains the pledge of an awakening, '*She sleepeth.*' At the same time in that holy humility which makes Him ever withdraw his miracles as much as possible from observation, He will by this word of a double signification cast a veil for the multitude over the work which He is about to accomplish.

And now, having thus spoken, He expelled from the house the crowd of turbulent mourners; and this for two reasons. Their presence, in the first place, was inappropriate and superfluous there; they were mourners for the dead, and the damsel was not dead; death in her was so soon to give place to returning life, that it did not deserve the name; it was but as a sleep and an awakening. Here was reason enough. But more than this, the boisterous and tumultuous grief of some, with the simulated grief, the hired lamentations of others (2 Chron. xxxv. 25; Eccles. xii. 5; Jer. ix. 17, 18; Am. v. 16),[1] gave no promise of the tone and temper of spirit, which became the witnesses of so holy and awful a mystery, a mystery from which even Apostles themselves were excluded—to say nothing of the scornful spirit, the laughter of unbelief (cf. Gen. xviii. 12), with which they had received the assurance, that the child should presently revive. Such scorners shall not witness the holy act: the pearls should not be cast before them. There is a similar putting of all forth on the part of Peter

[1] The presence of the hired mourners at a funeral, in general women (*θρηνῳδοί*, præficæ, cornicines, tubicines), was a Greek and Roman, as well as a Jewish, custom (see Becker, *Charicles*, vol. ii. p. 180). It lasts on to the present day. Many of these mourners and chanters, says Dr. Thomson of the funeral rites of modern Palestine, are hired, and weep, howl, beat their breast, and tear the hair according to contract (*The Land and the Book*, p. 101).

when about by the prayer of faith to raise Tabitha, although that was not in the same way provoked (Acts ix. 40; cf. Gen. xlv. 2; 2 Kin. iv. 33).

The house was now solitary and still. Two souls, believing and hoping, stand like funeral tapers beside the couch of the dead maiden—the father and the mother. The Church is represented in the three chief of its Apostles. Hereupon the solemn awakening finds place, and this without an effort on his part who is absolute Lord of the quick and the dead. '*He took the damsel*'—she was no more than a child, being '*of the age of twelve years*' (Mark v. 42)—'*by the hand* (cf. Acts ix. 41), *and called, saying, Maid, arise.*' St. Mark preserves for us, having probably received from the lips of Peter, the very words which the Lord spake in the very language wherein He uttered them, '*Talitha, Cumi,*' as he does the '*Ephphatha*' on another occasion (vii. 34;[1] cf. Matt. xxvii. 46). And at that word, and at the touch of that hand, '*her spirit came again,*[2] *and she arose straightway* (Luke viii. 56), *and walked*' (Mark v. 42). Hereupon, at once to strengthen that life which was come back to her, and to prove that she was indeed no ghost, but had returned to the realities of a mortal existence (cf. Luke xxiv. 41; John xxi. 5; Acts x. 41), and as marking the absolute calm of his own spirit,

[1] The mention of these words may be taken as evidence that in the intercourse of ordinary life our Lord employed the popular Aramaic. This does not, of course, decide anything concerning the language which He used, addressing mixed assemblages of Jews and heathen, learned and unlearned. On the extent to which Greek had at this time found its way into Palestine, and was familiar to all classes there, there is a masterly discussion in Hug's *Introduction to the New Testament*, vol. ii. p. 30, sqq., which has put the matter quite in a new light, and added greatly to the likelihood that He often in his discourses employed that language; see too an English essay to the same effect. His conversation with Pilate, with the Greeks who at the last passover desired to see Him (John xii. 21), not to urge some other, could scarcely have been carried on in any other language. Certainly we nowhere hear of an interpreter.

[2] The words of St. Luke, καὶ ἐπέστρεψε τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῆς, are exactly the same as those 1 Kin. xvii. 22, LXX.

which took in the least as the greatest, '*He commanded to give her meat.*' This injunction, this simple return as in a moment from the region of the supernatural into that of the natural, with its common needs, was the more necessary, as the parents in that ecstatic moment might easily have forgotten it.

We have here again the somewhat perplexing charge addressed to the parents, namely '*that they should tell no man what was done*' (Matt. ix. 40; Mark v. 43; Luke viii. 56). There is no such prohibition recorded by St. Matthew as laid upon them, while yet his statement leaves us no choice but to conclude that either having received this charge they gave no heed to it, or that such heed as they gave had profited nothing, for he tells us how '*the fame hereof went abroad into all that land.*' I call this charge perplexing, for though the number of persons actually present at the wonder-work was small, being only five in all, the number of those who knew that the child had been dead and had been brought back to life, and who must have associated this fact with Christ's presence in the chamber of death, was so large and so miscellaneous that it seems idle to have given them an injunction which certainly they would not observe. We may best, I think, understand this prohibition as an expression on our Lord's part of his desire to check that moral effervescence, that agitation of men's spirits, which a dwelling on his miracles might so easily have occasioned, and which might at this period of his ministry have proved so serious a hindrance to it.

St. Mark does not fail to record, as is his manner, the profound impression which this miracle made on the beholders; '*they were astonished with a great astonishment*' (cf. i. 27; ii. 12; iv. 41; vi. 51; vii. 37). St. Luke records the same, but with a slighter emphasis, and dwelling only on the astonishment of the parents.

These miracles of raising from the dead, whereof this is

the first, have always been regarded as the mightiest outcomings of the power of Christ; and with justice. They are those, also, at which unbelief is readiest to stumble, standing as they do in more direct contrast than any other to all which our experience has known. The line between health and sickness is not definitely fixed; the two conditions melt one into the other, and the transition from this to that is frequent. In like manner storms alternate with calms; the fiercest tumult of the elements allays itself at last; and Christ's word which stilled the tempest, did but anticipate and effect in a moment, what the very conditions of nature must have effected in the end. Even the transmutation from water to wine, and the multiplication of bread, are not without their analogies in nature, however remote; and thus too is it with most of the other miracles. But between being, and the negation of being, the opposition is not relative, but absolute; between death and life a gulf lies which no fact furnished by our experience can help us even in imagination to bridge over. It is nothing wonderful, therefore, that miracles of this class are signs more spoken against than any other among all the mighty works of the Lord.

The present will be a fitting moment to say something on the relations of difficulty in which the three miracles of this transcendent character stand to one another; for they are not exactly the same miracle repeated three times over, but may be contemplated as in an ever ascending scale of difficulty, each a more marvellous outcoming of the great power of Christ than the preceding. For as the body of one freshly dead, from which life has but just departed, is very different from a mummy or a skeleton, or from the dry bones which the prophet saw in the valley of death (Ezek. xxxvii.), so is it, though not in the same degree, different from a corpse, whence for some days the breath of life has fled. There is, so to speak, a fresh-trodden way between the body, and the soul which has just

forsaken it; this last lingering for a season near the tabernacle where it has dwelt so long, as knowing that the links that united them have not even now been divided for ever. Even science itself has arrived at the conjecture, that the last echoes of life ring in the body much longer than is commonly supposed; that for a while it is full of the reminiscences of life. Out of this we may explain how it so frequently comes to pass, that all which marked the death-struggle passes presently away, and the true image of the departed, the image it may be of years long before, reappears in perfect calmness and in almost ideal beauty. All this being so, we shall at once recognize in the quickening of him that had been four days dead (John xi. 17), a still mightier wonder than in the raising of the young man who was borne out to his burial (Luke vii. 12); whose burial, according to Jewish custom, will have followed death by an interval, at most, of a single day; and again in *that* miracle a mightier outcoming of Christ's power than in the present, wherein life's flame, like some newly-extinguished taper, was still more easily re-kindled, when thus brought in contact with Him who is the fountain-flame of all life. Immeasurably more stupendous than all these, will be the wonder of that hour, when all the dead of old, who will have lain, some of them for many thousand years, in the dust of death, shall be summoned from and shall leave their graves at the same quickening voice (John v. 28, 29).

7. *THE HEALING OF THE WOMAN WITH AN ISSUE OF BLOOD.*

Matt. ix. 20–22; Mark v. 25–34; Luke viii. 43–48.

IN all three reports which we have of this miracle, it is mixed up with that other of the raising of Jairus' daughter, and cuts that narrative in two. Such overflowing grace is in Him, the Prince of life, that as He is hastening to accomplish one work of grace and power, He accomplishes another, as by the way. 'His *obiter*,' in Fuller's words, 'is more to the purpose than our *iter*;' his *πάρεργον*, we might add, than our *ἔργον*. To the second and the third Evangelist we owe the most distinctive features of this miracle. St. Matthew relates it so briefly, and passes over circumstances so material, that, had we not the parallel records, we should miss much of the instruction which it contains. But doubtless it was intended, if not by their human penmen, yet by their Divine Author, that the several Gospels should thus mutually complete one another.

The Lord had consented to follow Jairus to his house, '*and much people thronged Him and pressed Him*,' curious, no doubt, to witness what the issue would be, and whether He could indeed raise the dying or dead child; for to no less a work, thus going, He seemed in a manner to have pledged himself. But if thus it fared with most, it was not so with all. Mingled with and confounded in that crowd eager to behold some new thing, was '*a certain woman*,[1] *which had an issue of blood twelve years, and had suffered many things of many physicians, and had spent*

[1] A sermon, wrongly attributed to St. Ambrose, makes this woman to have been Martha, the sister of Lazarus; *the Gospel of Nicodemus* (Thilo,

all that she had, and was nothing bettered, but rather grew worse.'[1] This woman, afflicted so long, who had suffered much from her disease, perhaps more from her physicians,[2] all whose means had been exhausted in costly remedies and in the vain quest of some cure, '*when she had heard of Jesus, came in the press behind, and touched his garment; for she said, If I may touch but his clothes, I shall be whole.*' Her faith, who so argued, was most real; we have the Lord's own testimony to this ('*Thy faith hath saved thee*'); while yet her conception of the manner of the working of Christ's healing power was a material conception, and not unmingled with error. He healed, as she must have supposed, by no power of his holy will, but rather by a certain magical influence and virtue which dwelt in Him, and emanated from Him. If she could put herself in relation with this, she would obtain all that she desired.[3] It is possible too that she '*touched*

Cod. Apocryph. vol. i. p. 562), Veronica. There is a strange story, full of inexplicable difficulties, told by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* vii. 18), of a statue, or rather two statues, in brass, one of Christ, another of this woman kneeling to Him, which existed in his time at Cæsarea Paneas, and which, according to tradition, had been raised by her in thankful commemoration of her healing: see the 10th excursus in the *Annotations* (Oxford, 1842) to Dr. Burton's *Eusebius.* The belief that these statues did refer to this event was so widely spread as to cause Julian, in his hostility to all memorials of Christianity, or according to others, Maximinus, to destroy them. There can be no doubt that a group, capable of being made to signify this event, was there, for Eusebius speaks as having himself seen it; but the correctness of the application is far more questionable. Justin Martyr's mistake of a statue erected at Rome to a Sabine deity (Semoni Sanco) for one erected in honour of Simon Magus, shows how little critical the early Christians could be in matters of this kind (see Deyling, *Obss. Sac.* vol. i. p. 279; Muretus, *Epistt.* l. 3, *ep.* 75). Even Jeremy Taylor, with all his uncritical allowance of legends, finds this one incredible (*Life of Christ*, part ii. sect. 12, § 20).

[1] The apocryphal report of Pilate to Tiberius forcibly paints her extreme emaciation, ὡς πᾶσαν τὴν τῶν ὀστέων ἁρμονίαν φαίνεσθαι, καὶ ὑέλου δίκην διαυγάζειν (Thilo, *Cod. Apocryph.* vol. i. p. 808).

[2] See Lightfoot (*Hor. Heb. in Marc.* v. 26) for an extraordinary list of remedies in use for this disorder.

[3] She partook, as Grotius well remarks, in the notion of the philosophers, Deum agere omnia φύσει, οὐ βουλήσει.

the hem of his garment' (cf. Mark vi. 56), not merely as its uttermost part, that therefore which she, timidly drawing near, could most easily reach, but as attributing a peculiar sanctity to it. For this hem, or blue fringe on the borders of the garment, was put there by divine command, and served to remind the Jewish wearer of the special relation to God in which he stood (Num. xv. 37–40; Deut. xxii. 12). Those, therefore, who would fain persuade the world that they desired never to have this out of their remembrance, were wont to make broad, or to 'enlarge, the borders of their garments' (Matt. xxiii. 5). But the faith of this woman, though thus imperfect in its form, and though it did not, as with a triumphant flood-tide, bear her over the peculiar difficulties which beset *her*, a woman coming in the world's face to acknowledge a need such as hers, was yet in its essence most true. It obtained, therefore, what it sought; it was the channel to her of the blessing which she desired. No sooner had she touched the hem of his robe than '*straightway the fountain of her blood was dried up, and she felt in her body that she was healed of that plague.*'[1]

The boon which she had gotten she would fain carry away in secret, if she might, but events were not to fall out as she intended; for '*Jesus, immediately knowing in Himself that virtue had gone out of Him, turned Him about in the press, and said, Who touched my clothes?*' The Evangelists employ language which in a measure falls in with the current of the woman's thoughts; yet we cannot for an instant suppose that healing power went forth from the Lord without the full consent of his will,[2]—that we have

[1] Ἀπὸ τῆς μάστιγος, scil. Θεοῦ, since disease must ever be regarded as the *scourge* of God, not always of personal sin, but ever of the sin which the one has in common with all; cf. 2 Macc. ix. 11, θεία μάστιξ, and Ecclus. xl. 9. So Æschylus (*Sept. adv. Theb.*), πληγεὶς Θεοῦ μάστιγι. The word *plague* (πληγή, plaga) is itself a witness for this truth.

[2] Chrysostom: Παρ' ἑκόντος ἔλαβε τὴν σωτηρίαν, καὶ οὐ παρ' ἄκοντος· ἤδει γὰρ τὴν ἁψαμένην.

here, on his part, an *unconscious* or involuntary healing, any more than on another occasion, when we read that 'the whole multitude sought to touch Him, for there went virtue out of Him, and healed them all' (Luke vi. 19). For if power went forth from Him to heal, without reference, on his part, to the spiritual condition of the person that was its subject, the ethical, which is ever by far the most important aspect of the miracle, would at once disappear. But He who saw Nathanael under the fig-tree (John i. 48), who 'needed not that any should testify of man, for He knew what was in man' (John ii. 25), must have known of this woman how sorely in her body she required his help, and how in her spirit she possessed that faith which was the one channel of communication between Him and any human need. Nor may his question, '*Who touched my clothes?*' be urged as implying that He was ignorant who had so done, and only obscurely apprehended that something had taken place. That question was asked, as the sequel abundantly proves, with quite another purpose than this. Had she succeeded in carrying away in secret that good which she had gotten, it would have failed to be at all that excellent gift to her which her Saviour intended that it should be. For this it was needful that she should be drawn from her hiding-place, and compelled to avouch both what she had sought, and what had found, of help and healing from Him. With as little force can it be urged that it would have been inconsistent with absolute truth for the Lord to profess ignorance, and to ask the question which He did ask, if all the while He perfectly knew what He thus seemed implicitly to say that He did not know. A father coming among his children, and demanding, Who committed this fault? himself conscious, even while he asks, but at the same time willing to bring the culprit to a free confession, and so to put him in a pardonable state, does he in any way violate the laws of highest truth? The same offence might be found with Elisha's

'Whence comest thou, Gehazi?' (2 Kin. v. 25), when his heart went with his unfaithful servant all the way that he had gone; and even in the question of God Himself to Adam, 'Where art thou?' (Gen. iii. 9), and to Cain, 'Where is Abel thy brother?' (Gen. iv. 9). In every case there is a moral purpose in the question,—an opportunity given at the latest moment for a partial making good of the fault by its unreserved confession, an opportunity which they whose examples have been here adduced, suffered to escape; but which this woman had grace given her to use.

But this question itself, '*Who touched my clothes?*' or as St. Luke has it, '*Who touched Me?*' when indeed the whole multitude was rudely pressing upon and crowding round Him, may suggest, and has suggested, some profitable reflections. Out of that thronging multitude one only '*touched*' with the touch of faith. She can scarcely have been the only sick and suffering one in all that multitude. Others there may have had complaints as inveterate as hers; but such, though as near or nearer in body, yet lacked that faith which would have been the connecting link between Christ's power and their need; and thus they crowded upon Him, but did not '*touch*' Him, did not so touch that virtue went forth from Him on them. It is evermore thus in the Church of God. Many '*throng*' Christ;[1] his in name; near to Him outwardly; in actual contact with the sacraments and ordinances of his Church; yet not *touching* Him, because not drawing nigh in faith, not looking for, and therefore not obtaining, life and healing from Him, and through these.[2]

[1] I cannot but think that the substitution of '*crush*' for '*throng*' here, as for instance it is done in the R. V., is a mistake, that '*throng*' with its slightly archaic air should have been suffered to remain.

[2] Augustine (*Serm.* lxii. 4): Quasi enim sic ambularet, ut a nullo prorsus corpore tangeretur, ita dicit, Quis me tetigit? Et illi, Turbæ te comprimunt. Et tanquam diceret Dominus, Tangentem quæro, non prementem. Sic etiam nunc est corpus ejus, id est, Ecclesia ejus. Tangit eam fides paucorum, premit turba multorum. . . . . Caro enim premit, fides tangit; and again (*Serm.* lxxvii. 4): Corpus ergo Christi multi

The disciples, and Peter as their spokesman, wonder at the question. A certain sense of its unreason as it presents itself to them, marks their reply: '*Thou seest the multitude thronging Thee, and sayest Thou, Who touched Me?*' He, however, re-affirms the fact, '*Somebody hath touched Me; for I perceive that virtue is gone out of Me.*' And now the woman, perceiving that any further attempts at concealment were useless, that to repeat the denial which she probably had made with the rest, for '*all denied*' (Luke viii. 45), would profit her nothing; unable, too, to escape his searching glance, for '*He looked round about to see her*' (Mark v. 32), '*came trembling,*' fearing it may be his anger, for the touch of one afflicted as she was caused ceremonial uncleanness (Lev. xv. 19, 25); '*and falling down before Him, she declared unto Him,*' and this '*before all the people, for what cause she had touched Him, and how she was healed immediately.*' Olshausen traces very beautifully the grace which reigns in this miracle, and in the order of the circumstances of it. This woman would have borne away a maimed blessing, hardly a blessing at all, had she been suffered to bear it away in secret and unacknowledged, and without being brought into any personal communion with her Healer. She hoped to remain in concealment out of a shame, which, however natural, was untimely in this the crisis of her spiritual life; but this hope of hers is graciously defeated. Her divine Healer draws her from the concealment she would fain have chosen; but even here, so

moleste premunt, pauci salubriter tangunt. Elsewhere he makes her the symbol of all the faithful (*Serm.* ccxlv. 3): Illi premunt, ista tetigit; Judæi affligunt, Ecclesia credidit; cf. Gregory the Great, *Moral.* iii. 20; xx. 17. Chrysostom has the same antithesis: Ὁ πιστεύων εἰς τὸν Σωτῆρα ἅπτεται αὐτοῦ· ὁ δὲ ἀπιστῶν θλίβει αὐτὸν καὶ λυπεῖ. Chemnitz (*Harm. Evang.* 67): Ita quoque in Ecclesiâ multi Christo approximant, externis auribus verbum salutis accipiunt, ore suo sacramentum corporis et sanguinis ipsius manducant et bibunt, nullam tamen efficaciam ex eo percipiunt, nec sentiunt fluxum illum peccatorum suorum sisti et exsiccari. Unde illud? Quia destituuntur verâ fide, quæ sola ex hoc fonte haurit gratiam pro gratiâ.

far as possible, He spares her; for not before, but after she is healed, does He require the open confession from her lips. She might have found it perhaps altogether too hard, had He demanded this of her before: but, waiting till the cure is accomplished, He helps her through the narrow way. Altogether spare her this painful passage He could not, for it pertained to her birth into the new life.[1]

And now He dismisses her with words of gracious encouragement: '*Daughter, be of good comfort* (cf. Matt. ix. 10); *thy faith hath made thee whole*'[2] (cf. Luke vii. 50; xvii. 19; xviii. 42).[3] Her faith had made her whole, and Christ's virtue had made her whole.[4] Not otherwise we say that we are justified by faith, and justified by Christ; faith not being itself the blessing; but the organ by which the blessing is received; the right hand of the soul, which lays hold on Him and on his righteousness. '*Go in peace*' (cf. 1 Sam. i. 17); this is not merely, 'Go with a blessing,' but, 'Enter into peace, as the element in which thy future life shall move;—*and be whole of thy plague*,' —which promise was at once fulfilled to her; for '*the woman was made whole from that hour*.'

[1] Sedulius, then, has exactly missed the point of the narrative, when of the Lord he says,

. . . . . furtumque fidele
Laudat, et ingenuæ tribuit sua vota rapinæ;

her fault lying in this, that she sought as this *furtum*, what she should have claimed openly: and no less St. Bernard (*De Divers. Serm.* xcix.) who makes her the figure of those who would do good hiddenly, avoiding all human applause: Sunt alii qui nonnulla bona occulte faciunt, sed tamen furari [regnum cælorum] dicuntur, quia laudem humanam vitantes, solo divino testimonio contenti sunt. Horum figuram tenuit mulier in Evangelio, &c. Rather she is the figure of those who would *get* good hiddenly, and without an open profession of their faith: who believe in their hearts, but shrink from confessing with their lips, that Jesus Christ is Lord, forgetting that both are needful (Rom. xi. 9).

[2] Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* iv. 20.

[3] Godet: Ta foi, et non pas, comme tu le pensais, l'attouchement matériel. Jésus fait ainsi rentrer dans le domaine moral la vertu qu'elle plaçait uniquement dans le domaine physique.

[4] Her faith, ὀργανικῶς, Christ's virtue, ἐνεργητικῶς. This, as the causa efficiens; that, as the conditio sine quâ non.

Theophylact traces a mystical meaning in this miracle. The complaint of this woman represents the ever-flowing fountain of sin; the physicians under whom she was nothing bettered, the world's prophets and sages, who, with all their remedies, their religions and their philosophies, prevailed nothing to stanch that fountain of evil in man's heart. To touch Christ's garment is to believe in his Incarnation, wherein He, first touching us, enabled us also to touch Him: and on this that healing, which in all those other things had been vainly sought, follows at once. And if we keep in mind how her uncleanness separated her off as one impure, we shall have here an exact picture of the sinner, drawing nigh to the throne of grace, but out of the sense of his impurity not 'with boldness,' rather with fear and trembling, hardly knowing what there he shall expect; but who is welcomed there, and all his carnal doubtings and questionings at once chidden and expelled, dismissed with the word of an abiding peace resting upon him.

8. *THE OPENING OF THE EYES OF TWO BLIND IN THE HOUSE.*

MATT. ix. 27–31.

WE have here a miracle which St. Matthew alone has recorded, being the first of those many healings of the blind related (Matt. xii. 22; xx. 30; xxi. 14; John ix.) or alluded to (Matt. xi. 5; Luke vii. 21) in the Gospels; each of them a literal fulfilment of that prophetic word of Isaiah concerning the days of Messiah: 'Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened' (xxxv. 5). Numerous as these miracles are, there is not one of them without distinguishing features of its own. That they should be so many is nothing wonderful, whether we regard the fact from a natural or a spiritual point of view. Regarded naturally, their number need not surprise us, if we keep in mind how far more common a calamity is blindness in the East than with us.[1] Regarded from a higher point of view, we need only remember how constantly sin is con-

[1] For this there are many causes. The dust and flying sand, pulverized and reduced to minutest particles, enter the eyes, causing inflammations which, being neglected, end frequently in total loss of sight. The sleeping in the open air, on the roofs of the houses, and the consequent exposure of the eyes to the noxious nightly dews, is another source of this malady. A modern traveller calculates that there are four thousand blind in Cairo alone; and Palgrave, writing of the diseases of Arabia (*Journey through Arabia*, vol. ii. p. 34), has these observations: 'Ophthalmia is fearfully prevalent, and goes on unchecked in many instances to the worst results. It would be no exaggeration to say that one adult out of every five has his eyes more or less damaged by the consequences of this disease.' In Syria, it is true, the proportion of blind is not at all so great, yet there also the calamity is far commoner than in Western lands; so that we find humane regulations concerning the blind, as a class, in the Law (Lev. xix. 14; Deut. xxvii. 18).

templated in Scripture as a moral blindness (Deut. xxviii. 29; Isai. lix. 10; Job xii. 25; Zeph. i. 17), and deliverance from sin as a removal of this blindness (Isai. xxix. 18; xlii. 18; xliii. 8; Ephes. v. 8; Matt. xv. 14); and we shall at once perceive how well it became Him who was 'the Light of the world' often to accomplish works which symbolized so well that higher work of illumination which He came into the world to accomplish.

'*And when Jesus departed thence*'—from the house of Jairus, Jerome supposes; but too much stress must not be laid on the connexion in which St. Matthew sets the miracle, nor the conclusion certainly drawn that he intended to place it in such immediate relation of time and place with that other which he had just told—'*two blind men followed Him, crying and saying, Thou Son of David, have mercy on us.*' In that '*Son of David*' they recognize Him as the promised Messiah (Matt. xxi. 9; xxii. 42; cf. Ezek. xxxiv. 23, 34; Luke i. 32). But their faith must not stop short in this mere confession of Him; it must be further tried; and the Lord proceeds to try it, though not so rudely as He tried that of the Syrophœnician woman at a later day (Matt. xv. 21–28). And thus they do not all at once obtain their petition; the Lord at first rather withdrawing Himself from them, suffering them to cry after Him, and for a while seeming to pay no regard to their cries. It is only '*when He was come into the house*,' and '*the blind men came to Him*' there, so testifying the earnestness of their desires and the faith of their hearts, that He yields to them the blessing which they sought.[1] He must obtain too, ere that may be, a further confession from their own lips: '*Believe ye that I am able to do this?*' And it is only after they, by their '*Yea, Lord*,' have avouched that they

[1] Calvin: Re igitur et verbis examinare voluit eorum fidem: suspensos enim tenens, imo præteriens quasi non exaudiat, patientiæ ipsorum experimentum capit, et qualem in ipsorum animis radicem egerit fides.

had faith to be healed, that the blessing is made theirs. Then indeed '*He touched their eyes*,' and that simple touch was enough, unsealing as it did for them the closed organs of vision. On other occasions He uses as conductors of his power, and helps to the faith of those who should be healed, some further means,—the clay mingled with spittle (John ix. 6, 7), or the moisture of his mouth alone (Mark viii. 23). We nowhere read of his opening the blind eyes simply by his word, though this of course lay equally within the range of his power. The words which accompany the act of grace, '*According to your faith be it unto you*,' are instructive for the insight they give us into the relation of man's faith and God's gift. The faith, which in itself is nothing, is yet the organ for receiving everything. It is the conducting link between man's emptiness and God's fulness; and herein is all the value which it has. It is the bucket let down into the fountain of God's grace, without which the man could never draw water of life from the wells of salvation; for the wells are deep, and of himself man has nothing to draw with. It is the purse, which cannot of itself make its owner rich, and yet effectually enriches by the wealth which it contains.[1]

'*And Jesus straitly charged them, saying, See that no man know it*' (cf. Mark i. 45; v. 43; Matt. xvii. 2). '*But they, when they were departed, spread abroad his fame in all that country*.' It is very characteristic, and rests on very profound differences between Roman Catholics and ourselves, that of their interpreters almost all—I am

[1] Faith, the ὄργανον ληπτικόν, nothing in itself, yet everything because it sets us in living connexion with Him in whom every good gift is stored. Thus on this passage Chemnitz (*Harm. Evang.* 68): Fides est instar haustri gratiæ cælestis et salutis nostræ, quo ex inscrutabili et inexhausto divinæ misericordiæ et bonitatis fonte, ad quem aliter penetrare non possumus, haurimus et ad nos attrahimus quod nobis salutare est. Calvin (*Inst.* iii. 11, 7): Fides etiamsi nullius per se dignitatis sit, vel pretii, nos justificat, Christum afferendo, sicut olla pecuniis referta hominem locupletat.

aware of no single exception—applaud rather than condemn these men for not adhering strictly to Christ's command, his earnest, almost threatening,[1] injunction of silence;—that the teachers in that Church of will-worship see in their disobedience the irrepressible overflowings of grateful hearts, which, as such, should be regarded not as a fault, but a merit. Some, alas! of the ancients, Theophylact, for instance, do not shrink from affirming that the men did not disobey at all in publishing the miracle; that Christ never intended them to observe his precept about silence, but gave it out of humility, being the better pleased that it was not observed.[2] But of the interpreters of the Reformed Church, whose first principle is to take God's Word as absolute rule and law, and to worship Him not with self-advised services, but after the pattern which He has shown, all stand fast to this, that obedience is better than sacrifice, even though the sacrifice be intended for God's special honour (1 Sam. xv. 21). They see, therefore, in this publishing of the miracle, despite of Christ's word to the contrary, a blemish in the perfectness of their faith who thus disobeyed; a fault which remained a fault, even while they recognize it as one which only grateful hearts could have committed.[3]

[1] Ἐνεβριμήσατο αὐτοῖς. Suidas explains ἐμβριμᾶσθαι = μετὰ ἀπειλῆς ἐντέλλεσθαι, μετ' αὐστηρότητος ἐπιτιμᾶν. See more on this word in a note on the raising of Lazarus (John xi. 33).

[2] Thus Aquinas (*Summ. Theol.* 2ª 2æ, qu. 104, art. 4): Dominus cæcis dixit ut miraculum occultarent, non quasi intendens eos per virtutem divini præcepti obligare; sed sicut Gregorius dicit 19 *Moral.*, servis suis se sequentibus exemplum dedit, ut ipsi quidem virtutes suas occultare desiderent, et tamen ut alii eorum exemplo proficiant, prodantur inviti. Cf. Maldonatus, *in loc.*

[3] Farrar (*Life of Christ*, vol. i. p. 359) judges these busy babblers still more harshly than I have done; and has perhaps warrant sufficient for this greater severity.

9. *THE HEALING OF THE PARALYTIC.*

MATT. ix. 1–8; MARK ii. 1–12; LUKE v. 17–26.[1]

THE account of St. Luke would leave us altogether in ignorance *where* this miracle of healing took place; but the other Evangelists here come to our aid. From St. Matthew we learn that it was in '*his own city*,' Capernaum, as from this description we should have justly concluded, even if St. Mark had not named it by name; seeing that as Bethlehem was the birth-place of Christ, and Nazareth his nursing-place, so was Capernaum his ordinary dwelling-place (cf. Matt. xvii. 24) from the time of his rejection by the Nazarenes (Luke iv. 30, 31).[2] We have then here one of the 'mighty works' with which at a later day He upbraided that greatly favoured but impenitent city (Matt. xi. 23). '*And it came to pass on a certain day as He was teaching, that there were Pharisees and doctors of the law sitting by, which were come out of every town of Galilee, and Judæa, and Jerusalem.*' It may have been a conference, more or less friendly upon the part of these, which had brought together as listeners and spectators a multitude so vast that all avenues of approach to the house were blocked up; '*there was no room to receive*

[1] Chrysostom (*in Matth. Hom.* 29) warns his hearers against the confounding of this miracle of healing with that of the impotent man at Bethesda, and then finding discrepancies between the one narrative and the other. The confusion, one would think, is so little likely to occur as hardly to be worth the complete refutation which he gives it. It is found, however, in the apocryphal *Evangelium Nicodemi* (see Thilo, *Cod. Apocryph.* vol. i. p. 556).

[2] Chrysostom: ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἤνεγκεν αὐτὸν ἡ Βεθλεέμ, ἡ δὲ ἔθρεψεν ἡ Ναζαρὲτ, ἡ δὲ εἶχεν αὐτὸν οἰκοῦντα διηνεκῶς Καπερναούμ.

them, no, not so much as about the door;'[1] and thus for later comers no opportunity, by any ordinary means, of near access to the Lord (cf. Matt. xii. 46, 47). Among these were some '*bringing one sick of the palsy.*' Only St. Mark records for us that he '*was borne of four;*' St. Luke with him relates the novel method which these took to bring him whom they bore within that circle of healing whereof the Lord was the living centre: '*When they could not come nigh unto Him for the press, they uncovered the roof where He was; and when they had broken it up, they let down the bed wherein the sick of the palsy lay.*' They first ascended to the roof; for, in Fuller's words, 'love will *creep*, but faith will *climb*, where it cannot *go*.' Yet this was not so difficult, seeing that commonly there was a flight of steps on the outside of the house, by which access to the roof was obtained; this serving in addition to, or sometimes instead of, an internal communication of the same kind. Such every traveller in those parts of southern Spain which bear a permanent impress of Eastern habits will have seen. Such are assumed in the Lord's words, 'Let him which is on the housetop not come down to take any thing out of his house' (Matt. xxiv. 17); he shall take the nearest and shortest way of escaping into the country: but he could only avoid the necessity of descending through the house by the existence of such steps as these.[2] Some will have it that the bearers, having thus reached the roof, let down their burden through the grating or trap-door already existing there (cf. 2 Kin. i. 2), or at most, enlarged such an aperture, till it would allow the passage of the paralytic and his bed. Others,[3] that Jesus was sitting in the open court,

[1] Τὰ *πρὸς τὴν θύραν*, scil. *μέρη* = *πρόθυρον*, vestibulum, atrium.

[2] The same will have existed in a Roman house. A witness, whom it is important to preserve from being tampered with, is shut up in the chamber adjoining the roof (cœnaculum super ædes),—and, to make all sure, scalis ferentibus in publicum obseratis, aditu in ædes verso (Livy, xxxix. 14; cf. Becker, *Gallus*, vol. i. p. 94).

[3] Shaw, for instance, quoted by Rosenmüller (*Alte und Neue Morgen-*

round which an Eastern house commonly is built; that to this they obtained access by the roof, and having broken through the breast-work or battlement (Deut. xxii. 8) made of tiles, which guarded the roof, and withdrawn the linen awning which was stretched over the court, let down their burden in the midst. But all this is without necessity and without warrant. St. Mark can mean nothing else than that a portion of the actual roof was removed, and so the bed on which the palsied man lay let down before the Lord.[1] This will seem less strange, if only we keep in mind that in all likelihood an upper chamber (*ὑπερῶον*) was the scene of this miracle. This, as the most retired (2 Kin. iv. 10; Acts ix. 37), and often the largest room in the house, extending over its whole area, was much used for purposes such as now drew the Lord and his hearers together[2] (Acts i. 13; xx. 8).

He who never takes ill that faith which brings men to Him, but only the unbelief which keeps them from Him, is in nothing offended at this interruption; yea, rather beheld with an eye well pleased the boldness of this act of theirs: '*Jesus, seeing their faith, said unto the sick of the palsy, Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven*[3] *thee;*' or, as St. Luke has it, '*Man, thy sins are forgiven thee.*'

land, vol. v. p. 129). He makes *τὸ μέσον* to signify the central court, impluvium, cava ædium. And so, too, Titus Bostrensis (in Cramer's *Catena*): *Εἴποι δ' ἄν τις ὕπαιθρον εἶναι τόπον, εἰς ὃν διὰ τῶν κεράμων κατεβίβασαν τὴν κλίνην τοῦ παραλύτου, μηδὲν παντελῶς τῆς στέγης ἀνατρέψαντες.* But against this use of *εἰς τὸ μέσον*, or rather *for* the common one, see Luke iv. 35; Mark iii. 3; xiv. 60.

[1] So Winer, *Realwörterbuch*, s. v. *Dach*; De Wette, *Archäologie*, p. 118, sqq.

[2] Vitringa, *De Synag.* p. 145, sqq.

[3] *Ἀφέωνται* (cf. Luke vii. 48; 1 John ii. 12): the old grammarians are not at one in the explanation of this form. Some make it = *ἀφῶνται*, 2 aor. conj., as in Homer *ἀφέῃ* for *ἀφῇ*. But others more rightly explain it as the præter. indic. pass. = *ἀφεῖνται*; though of these again some find in it an Attic, others, more correctly, a Doric form: cf. Herodotus, ii. 165, *ἀνέωνται*. This perfect passive will then stand in connexion with the perfect active *ἀφέωκα* for *ἀφεῖκα* (Winer, *Grammatik*, p. 77).

As He addresses another sorrowful soul, '*Daughter*, be of good comfort' (Matt. ix. 22), it is probable the tenderer appellation here also found place. Had we only the account of St. Matthew, we might be at a loss to understand wherein their special faith consisted, or why their faith, more than that of many others who brought their sick to Jesus (cf. Mark vi. 55, 56; vii. 32), should have been noted; but the other Evangelists explain what he has left obscure. From them we learn that it was a faith which overcame hindrances, and was not to be baffled by difficulties.[1] '*Their faith*' is not, as Jerome and Ambrose understand it, the faith of the bearers only. These must not be excluded;[2] but unless the sick man had approved what they did, it would not have been done: and Chrysostom, with more reason, affirms that it was alike their faith and his,[3] which the Lord saw, approved, and rewarded.

In what follows we have a beautiful example of the way in which the Giver of all good things gives *before* we ask, and *better* than we ask. This poor suppliant had as yet asked nothing; save, indeed, in the dumb asking of that earnest effort to struggle into the immediate neighbourhood of the Lord; and all that in this he dared to ask, certainly all that his friends and bearers sought for him, was that he might be healed of his palsy. Yet in him, no doubt, there was a deep feeling of the root out of which all sickness grows, namely, out of sin; perhaps in his own sickness he recognized the penalty of some especial sin whereof his conscience

[1] Bengel: Per omnia fides ad Christum penetrat. Gerhard (*Harm. Evang.* 43): Pictura est, quomodo in tentationibus et calamitatibus ad Christum nobis conentur intercludere hominum judicia, quales fuerunt amici Jobi, et qui Ps. iii. 3 dicunt: Non est salus ipsi in Deo ejus. Item: Legis judicium et propriæ conscientiæ accusationes. Et quomodo per illa omnia fides perrumpere debeat, ut in conspectum Christi Mediatoris se demittat.

[2] Τινὲς πιστότατοι, as in the *Evangelium Nicodemi* they are called.

[3] Οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἠνεσχετο χαλασθῆναι, μὴ πιστεύων.

accused him.[1] '*Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee,*' are words addressed to one burdened with a more intolerable weight than that of his bodily infirmities. Some utterance upon his part of a penitent and contrite heart may very probably have called out those words. In other instances the forgiveness of sin *follows* the outward healing; for we may certainly presume that such a forgiveness was the portion of the thankful Samaritan (Luke xvii. 19), of the impotent man, first healed, and then warned to sin no more (John v. 14); but here the remission of sin takes the precedence: nor is it hard to perceive the reason. In the sufferer's own conviction there existed so close a connexion between his sin and his sickness, that the bodily healing would have been scarcely intelligible to him, would have hardly brought home to him the sense of a benefit, unless in his conscience he had been also set free; perhaps he was incapable even of receiving the benefit, till the message of peace had been spoken to his spirit. The Epistle of St. James supplies an interesting parallel (v. 14, 15), where the same inner connexion is assumed between the raising of the sick and the forgiving of his sin. Others, with a slighter sense than this man of the relation between their sin and their suffering, were not first forgiven, and then healed; but thankfulness for their bodily healing first made them receptive of that better blessing, the 'grace upon grace,' which afterwards they obtained.

The absolving words are not *optative* only, no mere desire that so it might be, but *declaratory* that so it was: the man's sins *were* forgiven. Nor yet were they declaratory only of something which passed in the mind and intention of God; but, even as the words were spoken, there was shed abroad in his heart the sense of forgiveness and reconciliation with God. For indeed God's

[1] Bengel: Sine dubio magnus erat peccatorum magnorum sensus in isto homine.

justification of a sinner is not merely a word spoken *about* him, but a word spoken *to* him and *in* him; not an act of God's *immanent* in Himself, but *transitive* upon the sinner. In it the love of God, and with the love the consciousness of that love, is shed abroad in his heart upon whose behalf the absolving decree has been uttered (Rom. v. 5). The murmurers and cavillers understood rightly enough what the Lord meant by these words; that He, so speaking, did not merely wish and desire that this man's sins might be forgiven Him; that He did not, as the Church does now, in the name of another and wielding a delegated power, but in his own name, forgive him. They also understood rightly of this forgiveness of sins, that it is a *divine* prerogative; that, as no man can remit a debt save him to whom it is due, so no one can forgive sin save him against whom all sin is committed, that is, God; and out of this conviction, most true in itself, but most false in their present application of it, '*certain of the Scribes sitting there*' said within themselves, '*Why doth this man thus speak blasphemies?* (cf. Luke vii. 49; John x. 33). *Who can forgive sins, but God only?*'

Olshausen bids us note here the profound insight into the relations between God and the creature, involved in the scriptural use of the word 'blasphemy;' a use of which profane antiquity knew nothing. With it 'to blaspheme' meant only to speak evil of a person[1] (a use not foreign to Scripture, 1 Cor. iv. 13; Tit. iii. 2; 2 Pet. ii. 2; Jud. 8), and then, to speak something of an evil omen. The monotheistic religion alone included in blasphemy not merely words of cursing and outrage against the name of God, but all snatchings on the part of the creature at honours which of right belonged only to the Creator (Matt. xxvi. 65; John x. 36).[2] Had He who in

[1] Βλασφημεῖν as opposed to εὐφημεῖν.

[2] Bengel: Blasphemia est, cum I. Deo tribuuntur indigna. II. Deo negantur digna. III. Dei propria communicantur iis, quibus non competunt.

his own name declared, '*Thy sins be forgiven thee*,' been less than the only-begotten Son of the Father and sharer in all prerogatives of the Godhead, He would indeed have spoken blasphemies, as they supposed. Believing Him only a man, they were right in saying He blasphemed. Their sin was not in this, but in that self-chosen blindness of theirs, which would not allow them to recognize any glory in Him higher than man's; in the pride and the obstinacy which led them, having arrived at a foregone conclusion as to what kind of Saviour they would have, wilfully to close their eyes to all in their own Scriptures which set Him forth as other than they had themselves resolved He should be.[1]

It is not for nothing that the Lord is said to have '*perceived in his spirit that they so reasoned within themselves*.' His soul was human, but his '*spirit*' was divine; and by this divine faculty He perceived the unspoken counsels and meditations of their hearts[2] (John vi. 61), and perceiving laid open: just as elsewhere He is said to have 'answered' the unuttered, as though it had been the uttered, thought of the Pharisee at whose table He sat (Luke vii. 40). They should be doubly convinced; and first by the proof which He gave that the thoughts and meditations of all hearts were open and manifest to Him, while yet it is God only who searches into these (1 Sam. xvi. 7; 1 Kin. viii. 39; 1 Chron. xxviii. 9; 2 Chron. vi. 30; Jer. xvii. 10; Ezek. xi. 5; Prov. xv. 11; Acts i. 24); only of the Divine Word could it be affirmed that 'He is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart' (Heb. iv. 12).[3] '*Why reason ye these things in your hearts?*'

[1] Augustine (*Enarr.* iii. *in Ps.* xxxvi. 25): Quis potest dimittere peccata [inquiunt] nisi solus Deus? Et quia ille erat Deus, talia cogitantes audiebat. Hoc verum de Deo cogitabant, sed Deum præsentem non videbant. Fecit ergo . . . quod viderent, et dedit quod crederent.

[2] Grotius: Non ut prophetæ per afflatum, sed suo spiritu.

[3] Gerhard (*Harm. Evang.* 43): Jesus igitur exponens Pharisæis quid taciti apud se in intimis cordium recessibus cogitabant, ostendit se plus

And on this first conviction there follows a second: '*Whether is it easier to say to the sick of the palsy, Thy sins be forgiven thee; or to say, Arise and take up thy bed, and walk?*' He indicates to them here the exact line in which their hard and unrighteous thoughts about Him were at that moment travelling. Something of this sort they were murmuring within themselves, 'These honours are easily snatched. Any pretender may go about the world, saying to this man and that, "*Thy sins be forgiven thee.*" But what proof is there that this word of his, spoken on earth, is ratified in heaven? The very nature of the power which this man claims secures him from conviction; for this releasing of a man from the condemnation of his sin is an act wrought in the inner spiritual world, not necessarily attested by any outer and visible sign; therefore it is safely challenged, any disproof of it being impossible.' And our Lord's answer, meeting this evil thought of theirs, is in fact this: 'You accuse Me that I am claiming a safe power, since, in the very nature of the benefit bestowed, no sign follows; there is nothing to testify whether I have challenged it rightfully or not. I will therefore put Myself now to a more decisive proof. I will speak a word, I will claim a power, which if I claim falsely, I shall be convinced upon the instant as an impostor and a deceiver. *But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins* (*He saith to the sick of the palsy*), *I say unto thee, Arise, and take up thy bed,*[1] *and go*

esse quam hominem; et eâdem potestate, divinâ scilicet, quâ secreta cordium videat, se etiam peccata remittere posse.

[1] Κράββατος, or as Tischendorf in all the best MSS. finds it, κράβαττος, = *grabatus* (in Luke κλινίδιον), a mean pallet used by the poorest, = σκίμπους, ἀσκάντης. It is a Macedonian word, entirely rejected by Greek purists (Becker, *Charicles*, vol. ii. p. 121; Lobeck, *Phrynichus*, p. 62). Sozomen (*Hist. Eccl.* i. 11) tells the story of a bishop in Cyprus, who teaching the people from this scripture, and having to repeat the Lord's words, substituted σκίμπους for κράββατος, and was rebuked by another bishop present, who asked if the word which was good enough for Christ was not also good enough for him.

thy way into thine house.[1] By the effects, as they follow or do not follow, you may judge whether I have a right to say to him, *Thy sins be forgiven thee.*'[2]

In our Lord's argument it must be carefully noted that He does not ask, 'Which is easier, to forgive sins, or to raise a sick man by a word?' for that act of forgiving could not be affirmed to be easier than this of healing; but, 'Which is easier, to claim this power, or to claim that; *to say*, Thy sins be forgiven thee, or *to say*, Arise and walk?' And He then proceeds: 'That is easier, and I will now prove my right to say it, by saying with effect and with an outward consequence setting its seal to my truth, the harder word, *Rise up and walk.* By doing that which is submitted to the eyes of men, I will attest my right and power to do that which, in its very nature, lies outside of the region of visible proofs. By these visible tides of God's grace I will give you to know in what way the great under-currents of his love are setting, and make clear that those and these are alike obedient to my word. From this which I will now do openly and before you all,

[1] Compare Isai. xxxv. 3, LXX, when he recounts the promises of Messiah's time: Ἰσχύσατε, χεῖρες ἀνειμέναι, καὶ γόνατα παραλελυμένα.

[2] Jerome (*Comm. in Matt.* in loc.): Utrum sint paralytico peccata dimissa, solus noverat, qui dimittebat. Surge autem et ambula, tam ille qui consurgebat, quam hi qui consurgentem videbant approbare poterant. Fit igitur carnale signum, ut probetur spirituale. Bernard (*De Divers. Serm.* xxv.): Blasphemare me blasphematis, et quasi ad excusandum visibilis curationis virtutem, me invisibilem dicitis usurpare. Sed ego vos potius blasphemos esse convinco, signo probans visibili invisibilem potestatem. Corn. a Lapide: Qui dicit, Remitto tibi peccata, mendacii argui non potest, sive ea reverâ remittit, sive non, quia nec peccatum nec peccati remissio oculis videri potest; qui autem dicit paralytico, Surge et ambula, se et famam suam evidenti falsitatis periculo exponit; re ipsâ enim si paralyticus non surgat, falsitatis, imposturæ et mendacii ab omnibus arguetur et convincetur. . . . Unde signanter Christus non ait, Quid est facilius, remittere peccata, an sanare paralyticum, sed dicere, Dimittuntur tibi peccata, an dicere, Surge et ambula? Bengel: In se, utrumque est divinæ potestatis et potentiæ; et intimus in se est peccati et morbi nexus: una, quæ utrumque tollit, virtus. Ratione judicii humani facilius est dicere, Remissa sunt; et hoc potest, quod minus videtur, qui potest dicere, Surge, quod majus videtur.

you may conclude that it is no "robbery" (Phil. ii. 6) upon my part, no snatching at what is not mine, to claim also the power of forgiving men their sins.'[1] Thus, to use a familiar illustration of our Lord's argument, it would be easier for a man equally ignorant of French and Chinese, to claim to know the last than the first; not that the language itself is easier; but that, in the one case, multitudes could disprove his claim; and, in the other, only a rare scholar or two in the land.

In '*power on earth*' there lies a tacit antithesis to power in heaven. 'This power is not exercised, as you deem, only by God *in heaven*; but also by the Son of man *on earth*. You rightly assert that it is only exercised by Him whose proper dwelling is in the heavens; but He, who in the person of the Son of man, has descended also upon earth, has brought down this power with Him here. On earth also is One who can speak and it is done.' We have at Matt. xvi. 19; xviii. 18, 'on earth,' and 'in heaven,' set over against one another in the same antithesis. The parallels, however, are imperfect, since the Church binds and looses by a committed, and not an inherent, power; as one has beautifully said, '*Facit in terris opera cœlorum*,' but only in the name and by the might of her heavenly Head. It at first surprises that as '*Son of man*' He claims this power; for this of forgiving

[1] Maldonatus, with his usual straightforward meeting of a difficulty, observes here: Poterit autem aliquis merito dubitare, quomodo Christus quod probandum erat, concludat. Nam si remittere peccata erat re verâ difficilius, dum experientiâ curati paralytici docet se quod re ipsâ facilius est, posse facere: non bene probat posse et se peccata remittere, quod erat difficilius. Respondeo, Christum tantum probare voluisse sibi esse credendum, quod bene probat ab eo, cujus probatio erat difficilior; quasi dicat, Si non fallo cum dico paralytico, Surge et ambula, ubi difficilius est probare me verum dicere, cur creditis me fallere cum dico, Remittantur tibi peccata tua? Denique ex re, quæ effectu probari potest, in re quæ probari non potest, sibi fidem facit. Augustine (*Exp. ad Rom.* § 23): Declaravit ideo se illa facere in corporibus, ut crederetur animas peccatorum dimissione liberare; id est, ut de potestate visibili potestas invisibilis mereretur fidem.

sins being a *divine* attribute, we might expect that He would now call Himself by his better name, since only as Son *of God* such prerogative was his.[1] The Alexandrian fathers, in conflict with the Nestorians, pressed these words in proof of the entire communication of all the properties of Christ's divine nature to his human; so that whatever one had, was so far common to both that it might also be predicated of the other.[2] Thus far assuredly they have right, namely, that unless the two natures had been indissolubly knit together in a single person, no such language could have been used; yet '*Son of man*' being the standing title whereby the Lord was well pleased to designate Himself, asserting as it did that He was at once one with humanity, and the crown of humanity, it is simpler to regard the term here as merely equivalent to Messiah, without attempting to extort any dogmatic conclusions from it. All which our Lord explicitly claimed for Himself in those great discourses recorded John v. 17–23; x. 30–38, He implicitly claims here.

And now this word of his is confirmed and sealed by a sign following. The man did not refuse to answer this appeal: '*And immediately he arose, took up the bed*[3] (cf. John v. 8; Acts ix. 34), *and went forth before them all*;' carrying now the bed on which he was lately carried; the couch which was before the sign of his sickness being now the sign of his cure; and they who just before barred and blocked up his path, now making way for him, and allowing free egress from the assembly (cf. Mark x. 48, 49).

Of the effects of this miracle on the Pharisees nothing is told us; probably there was nothing good to tell. But

[1] See Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* iv. 10) for a somewhat different reason why the Lord should here call Himself, Son of man.

[2] See Cyril of Alexandria, in Cramer, *Catena*, in loc. This is the *communicatio idiomatum*.

[3] Arnobius (*Con. Gen.* i. 45), speaking generally of Christ's healings, but with manifest allusion to this: Suos referebant lectos alienis paulo ante cervicibus lati. Bengel: Lectulus hominem tulerat; nunc homo lectulum ferebat.

the people, less hardened against the truth, more receptive of divine impressions, '*marvelled*,' so we read in St. Matthew, but better, '*were afraid*;'[1] or as St. Mark has it, '*they were all amazed*' (cf. Matt. xii. 23; Mark i. 27; v. 42; vi. 51; vii. 37), '*and they glorified God, saying, We never saw it on this fashion*' (cf. Matt. xv. 31; John xi. 45, 46). The miracle had done its office. The beholders marvelled at the wonderful work wrought before their eyes; and this their marvel deepened into holy fear, which found its utterance in the ascription of glory to God, '*who had given such power unto men*.' We need not suppose that they very accurately explained to themselves, or could have explained to others, their feeling of holy exultation; but they felt truly that what was given to one man, to Him who had just set Himself forth under the title of 'the Son of man,' was given for the sake of all, and given ultimately *to* all, that thus it was indeed given '*unto men*.' They dimly understood, but they mightily felt, that He possessed these powers as the true Head and Representative of the race, that therefore gifts to Him were a rightful subject of rejoicing for every member of the family of man.

[1] Ἐφοβήθησαν, strong as it is, is a reading here to be preferred to the ἐθαύμασαν of our received text.

10. *THE CLEANSING OF THE LEPER.*

Matt. viii. 1–4; Mark i. 40–45; Luke v. 12–16.

WE shall ill understand this miracle without something first said concerning leprosy in general, and the meaning of the uncleanness attached to it in the Levitical law. The medical details, the distinction between one kind of leprosy and another, as between the white (λευκή), which among the Jews was the most frequent, and the yet more terrible elephantiasis (thought by many to have been that with which Job was visited, and so named because in it the feet swelled to an *elephantine* size), would be here out of place. Only it will be necessary to correct a mistake, common to all writers who, like Michaëlis, can see in the Levitical ordinances little more, for the most part, than regulations of police or of a Board of health, or, at the highest, rules for the well ordering of an earthly society; thus missing altogether a main purpose which these ordinances had—namely, that by them men might be trained into a sense of the cleaving taint which is theirs from birth, into a confession of impurity and of consequent separation from God, and thus into a longing after purity and re-union with Him. I refer to the mistaken assumption that leprosy was catching from one person to another; and that lepers were so carefully secluded from their fellow-men, lest they might communicate the poison of the disease to others; as, in like manner, that the torn garment, the covered lip, the cry 'Unclean, unclean' (Lev. xiii. 45), were warnings to all that they should keep aloof, lest unawares touching a leper, or drawing into too

great a nearness, they should become partakers of his disease. So far from any danger of the kind existing, nearly all who have looked closest into the matter agree that the sickness was incommunicable by ordinary contact from one person to another. A leper might transmit it to his children,[1] or the mother of a leper's children might take it from him; but it was by no ordinary contact communicable from one person to another.

All the notices in the Old Testament, as well as in other Jewish books, confirm the statement that we have here something very much higher than a mere sanitary regulation. Thus, where the law of Moses was not observed, no such exclusion necessarily found place; Naaman the leper commanded the armies of Syria (2 Kin. v. 1); Gehazi, with his leprosy that never should be cleansed (2 Kin. v. 27), talked familiarly with the king of apostate Israel (2 Kin. viii. 5). And even where the law of Moses was in force, the stranger and the sojourner were expressly exempted from the ordinances relating to leprosy; which could not have been, had the disease been contagious, and the motives of the leper's exclusion been not religious, but civil.[2] How, moreover, should the Levitical priests,

[1] See Robinson, *Biblical Researches*, vol. i. p. 359.

[2] See a learned dissertation by Rhenferd, *De Leprâ Cutis Hebræorum*, in Meuschen, *Nov. Test. ex Talm. illust.* pp. 1086–1089; who concludes his disquisition on this part of the subject thus: Ex quibus, nisi nos omnia fallunt, certe concludimus, præcipuis Judæorum magistris, traditionumque auctoribus nunquam in mentem incidisse ullam de lepræ contagio suspicionem, omnemque hanc de contagiosâ leprâ sententiam plurimis antiquissimisque scriptoribus æque ac Mosi plane fuisse incognitam. Compare the extract from Balsamon, in Suicer, *Thes.* s. v. λεπρός, where, speaking of the custom of the Eastern Church, he says, 'They frequent our churches and eat with us, in nothing hindered by the disease.' In like manner there was a place for them, though a place apart, in the synagogues.—I ought to add that Dr. Belcher, in a very learned essay in the *Dublin Quarterly Journal of Medical Science*, May 1864, with the title *The Hebrew, Medieval, and Modern Leprosies compared*, does *not* consider that Rhenferd has proved his point. He has followed up his inquiries, and has arrived at the same results in his work, *Our Lord's Miracles of Healing*, pp. 81–105.

had the disease been this creeping infection, have themselves escaped it, obliged as they were by their very office to submit the leper to actual handling and closest examination? Lightfoot can only explain this by taking for granted in their case a perpetual miracle.

But there is no need of this. The ordinances concerning leprosy had another and far deeper significance, into which it will be needful a little to enter. It is clear that the same principle which made all having to do with death, as mourning (Lev. xxi. 1; Ezek. xliv. 25), a grave (Luke xi. 44; Matt. xxiii. 27), a corpse, the bones of a dead man (Ezek. xxxix. 12–15; 2 Kin. xxiii. 20), the occasions of a ceremonial uncleanness, inasmuch as all these were signs and consequences of sin, might consistently with this have made every sickness an occasion of uncleanness, each of these being also death beginning, partial death—echoes in the body of that terrible reality, sin in the soul. But instead of this, in a gracious sparing of man, and not driving things to the uttermost, God took but one sickness, one of these visible outcomings of a tainted nature, in which to testify that evil was not from Him, could not dwell with Him. He linked this teaching but with one; by his laws concerning it to train men into a sense of a clinging impurity, which needed a Pure and a Purifier to overcome and expel, and which nothing short of his taking of our flesh could drive out. And leprosy, the sickness of sicknesses, was throughout these Levitical ordinances selected of God from the whole host of maladies and diseases which had broken in upon the bodies of men. Bearing his testimony against it, He bore his testimony against that out of which every sickness grows, against sin; as not from Him, as grievous in His sight; and against the sickness also itself as grievous, being as it was a visible manifestation, a direct consequence, of sin, a forerunner of that death, which by the portal of dis-

obedience and revolt had found entrance into natures created by Him for immortality.

And fearful indeed, as might be expected, was that disease, round which this solemn teaching revolved. Leprosy was nothing short of a living death, a corrupting of all the humours, a poisoning of the very springs, of life; a dissolution little by little of the whole body, so that one limb after another actually decayed and fell away. Aaron exactly describes the appearance which the leper presented to the eyes of the beholders, when, pleading for Miriam, he says, 'Let her not be as one dead, of whom the flesh is half consumed when he cometh out of his mother's womb' (Num. xii. 12). The disease, moreover, was incurable by the art and skill of man;[1] not that the leper might not return to health; for, however rare such cases might be, they are contemplated as possible in the Levitical law. But then the leprosy left the man, not in obedience to any skill of the physician, but purely and merely through the good will and mercy of God. This notorious helplessness of man in the matter dictates the speech of Jehoram, who, when Naaman is sent to demand healing from him, exclaims, 'Am I God, to kill and to make alive, that this man doth send unto me to recover a man of his leprosy?' (2 Kin. v. 7); as though the king of Syria had been seeking to fasten a quarrel upon him.

The leper, thus fearfully bearing about in the body the outward and visible tokens of sin in the soul, was treated throughout as a sinner, as one in whom sin had reached its climax, as *dead* in trespasses and sins. He was himself a dreadful parable of death. He bore about him the emblems of death (Lev. xiii. 45); the rent garments, mourning for himself as one dead; the head bare, as was their wont who

[1] Cyril of Alexandria calls it πάθος οὐκ ἰάσιμον. Dr. Thomson (*The Land and the Book*, pt. iv. c. 43) has a terrible account of this disease in the East; and Spratt, in his *Travels and Researches in Crete*, vol. i. p. 38, sqq., of its ravages at this day in that island.

were defiled by communion with the dead (Num. vi. 9; Ezek. xxiv. 17); and the lip covered (Ezek. xxiv. 17).[1] In the restoration, too, of a leper, precisely the same instruments of cleansing were in use, the cedar-wood, the hyssop, and scarlet, as were used for the cleansing of one defiled through a dead body, or aught pertaining to death; these same being never employed on any other occasion (cf. Num. xix. 6, 18 with Lev. xiv. 4–7). When David exclaims, 'Purge me *with hyssop*, and I shall be clean' (Ps. li. 7), he contemplates himself as a spiritual leper, as one who had sinned a sin unto death, who needs therefore through the blood of sprinkling to be restored to God from the very furthest degree of separation from Him. And leprosy being this sign and token of sin, and of sin reaching to and culminating in death, could not do otherwise than entail a total exclusion from the camp or city of God. God is not a God of the dead; He has no fellowship with death, for death is the correlative of sin; but only of the living. But the leper was as one dead, and as such was shut out of the camp[2] (Lev. xiii. 46; Num. v. 2–4) and the city (2 Kin. vii. 3),[3] this law being so strictly enforced, that there was no exemption from it even for the sister of Moses herself (Num. xii. 14, 15); and as little for kings (2 Chron. xxvi. 21; 2 Kin. xv. 5); men being by this exclusion taught that what here found place in a figure, should find place in very deed with every one found in the death of sin; he should be shut out from the true City of God. 'There shall nowise enter into it anything that defileth,

[1] Spencer calls him well, sepulcrum ambulans; and Calvin: Pro mortuis habiti sunt, quos lepra a sacro cœtu abdicabat. And when through the Crusades leprosy had been introduced into Western Europe, it was usual to clothe the leper *in a shroud*, and to say for him the masses for the dead. Godet: C'était la mort en pleine conscience de la vie. Compare Milton, *Samson Agonistes*, 102: 'Myself my sepulchre, a moving grave.'

[2] Herodotus (i. 138) mentions the same law of exclusion as existing among the Persians, who accounted in like manner that leprosy was an especial visitation on account of especial sins.

[3] Josephus, *Antt.* iii. 11. 9.

neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie' (Rev. xxi. 27).

Nothing of all this, as need hardly be observed, in the least implied that the leper was a worse or guiltier man than his fellows. Being, indeed as it was, this symbol of sin, leprosy was often the punishment of sins committed against the divine government. Miriam, Gehazi, Uzziah[1] are all cases in point; and when Moses says to the people, 'Take heed in the plague of leprosy' (Deut. xxiv. 8), this is no admonition diligently to observe the laws about leprosy, but a warning lest any disobedience of theirs should provoke God to visit them with this plague.[2] The Jews themselves called it 'the finger of God,' and emphatically 'the stroke.' It attacked, they said, first a man's house; and then, if he refused to turn, his clothing; and lastly, should he persist in sin, himself:[3]—a fine parable, let the fact have been as it might, of the manner in which God's judgments, if a man refuse to listen to them, reach ever nearer to the centre of his life. So, too, they said that a man's true repentance was the one condition of his leprosy leaving him.[4]

Seeing then that leprosy was this outward and visible sign of the innermost spiritual corruption, this sacrament of death, on no fitter shape of physical evil could the Lord of life show forth his power. He will thus prove Himself the conqueror of death in life, as elsewhere of death accomplished; and He therefore fitly urges his victory over this most terrible form of physical evil as a convincing testimony of his Messiahship: 'the lepers are cleansed' (Matt.

[1] The strange apocryphal tradition of Judas Iscariot perishing by the long misery of a leprosy, in its most horrible form of elephantiasis, had this same origin (Gfrörer, *Die heilige Sage*, vol. i. p. 179).

[2] See Rhenferd, p. 1082.

[3] Molitor, *Philosophie der Geschichte*, vol. iii. p. 191.

[4] Thus Jerome, following earlier Jewish expositors, explains 'smitten of God' (Isai. liii. 4) as = leprosus; and out of that passage and the general belief in leprosy as a *νόσος θεήλατος*, upgrew the old Jewish tradition of the Messiah being a leper (see Hengstenberg, *Christologie*, vol. i. p. 382).

xi. 5). Nor may we doubt that the terribleness of the infliction, the extreme suffering with which it was linked, the horror with which it must have filled the sufferer's mind, as he marked its slow but inevitable progress, to be arrested by no human hand, the ghastly hideousness of its unnatural whiteness (Num. xii. 10; Exod. iv. 6; 2 Kin. v. 27), must all have combined to draw out his pity,[1] in whom love went hand in hand with power, the Physician and Healer of the bodies as of the souls of men.[2]

We address ourselves now to the first of these acts at once of healing and of cleansing whereof the Gospels keep a record. The ascended Lord, we are told, confirmed the word of his servants with signs following (Mark xvi. 20); in the days of his flesh He did as much for his own. His discourse upon the Mount, that solemn revision of the moral code, lifting it up to a higher level, has scarcely ended, when this and other of his most memorable miracles are performed. He will thus set his seal to all that He has just been teaching, and vindicate his right to speak in the language of authority which He has there held[3] (Matt. vii. 29). As He was descending from the mountain, '*behold, there came a leper and worshipped Him*;' he was one, in the language of St. Luke, '*full of leprosy*,'[4] so that it was not a spot here and there, but the tetter had spread over his whole body; he was leprous from head to foot. This man had ventured, it may be, to linger on the outskirts of the listening crowd, and, undeterred by the severity of the closing sentences of Christ's discourse,

[1] Cf. Mark i. 41, ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς σπλαγχνισθείς.

[2] See the 'deeply pathetic story,' as the author of the *Life of Lord Lawrence* calls it, showing what nowadays may be the condition of a leper in the East (2nd edit. vol. ii. p. 173).

[3] Jerome (in loc.): Recte post prædicationem atque doctrinam signorum offertur occasio, ut per virtutum miracula præteritus apud audientes sermo firmetur.

[4] Πλήρης λέπρας. We may compare λελεπρωμένος, applied to Naaman (2 Kin. v. 1, LXX).

came now to claim the blessings promised at its opening to the suffering and the mourning.

Such worship as he offered to the Lord was an act of profound reverence, but not of necessity a recognition of a divine character in him to whom it was offered. Thus we cannot for an instant suppose that there was revealed to this poor suppliant outcast a mystery which was not till long after revealed to Apostles themselves (Matt. xvi. 17). Some vague sense of the Divinity which invested the Lord this sufferer may not have been without; even as the words in which he clothed his petition are the utterance of a faith at once so true and so humble, content to abide the issue, whatever that may be; and having declared its desire, to leave the granting or the withholding of this to a higher wisdom and love: '*Lord, if Thou wilt, Thou canst make me clean.*'[1] There is no questioning here of the power; nothing of *his* unbelief who said, '*If thou canst do anything, help us*' (Mark ix. 22). '*And Jesus—moved with compassion,*' as St. Mark alone records—'*put forth his hand, and touched him,*'[2] ratifying and approving his utterance of faith, by granting his request in the very words wherein that request had been made: '*I will; be thou clean.*[3] *And immediately his leprosy was cleansed.*' This touching of the unclean by Christ is noteworthy, drawing after it, as according to the ordinances of the Law it did, a ceremonial

[1] Yet the Roman theologians in vain endeavour to draw from this passage an approval of the timor diffidentiæ in our prayers which have relation to the things of eternal life, such as the forgiveness of sins, the gift of the Spirit: these we are to ask, assuredly believing that we have them. There is this diffidence in the leper's request, because he is asking a temporal benefit, which must always be asked under conditions, and which may be refused; though to the faithful man the refusing is indeed a granting in a higher form (see Gerhard, *Locc. Theoll.* loc. 17, § 138).

[2] Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* iv. 35): Quoniam ipse erat authenticus Pontifex Dei Patris, inspexit illos secundum Legis arcanum, significantis Christum esse verum disceptatorem et elimatorem humanarum macularum.

[3] Bengel: Echo prompta ad fidem leprosi maturam. Ipsa leprosi oratio continebat verba responsionis optatæ.

uncleanness. The Gnostics saw in this non-observance by the Lord of the ordinances of the Law a confirmation of their assertion that this Law had not proceeded from the good God, but from the evil.[1] Tertullian answers them well,[2] dwelling mainly on the deeper meaning which lay in the prohibition to touch the ceremonially unclean, namely, that we should not defile ourselves through partaking in other men's sins; as St. Paul, transfiguring these ceremonial prohibitions into moral, exclaims, 'Come out from among them, and be ye separate, *and touch not the unclean thing*' (2 Cor. vi. 17). These carnal prohibitions held good for all, till He came, the Pure to whom all things were pure; who was at once incontaminate and incontaminable; in whom, first among men, the advancing tide of this world's evil was effectually arrested and rolled back. Another would have defiled *himself* by touching the leper (Lev. xiii. 44–46); but He, Himself remaining undefiled, cleansed him whom He touched; for in Him health overcame sickness,—and purity, defilement,—and life, death.[3]

[1] Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* iv. 9): Ut æmulus Legis tetigit leprosum, nihil faciens præceptum Legis, per contemptum inquinamenti.

[2] *Ibid.*: Non pigebit . . . figuratæ legis vim ostendere; quæ in exemplo leprosi non contingendi, immo ab omni commercio submovendi, communicationem prohibebat hominis delictis commaculati; cum qualibus et apostolus cibum quoque vetat sumere; participari enim stigmata delictorum, quasi ex contagione, si quis se cum peccatore miscuerit. Itaque Dominus volens altius intelligi Legem, per carnalia spiritalia significantem, et hoc nomine non destruens sed magis exstruens quam pertinentius volebat agnosci, tetigit leprosum, a quo etsi homo inquinari potuisset, Deus utique non inquinaretur, incontaminabilis scilicet. Ita non præscribetur illi quod debuerit Legem observare, et non contingere immundum, quem contactus immundi non erat inquinaturus. He is less successful in his interpretation of the spiritual significance (*De Pud.* 20), where he goes into more details in the matter. So Calvin (in loc.): Ea est in Christo puritas, quæ omnes sordes et inquinamenta absorbeat, neque se contaminat leprosum tangendo, neque Legem transgreditur; and he beautifully finds in his stretching forth the hand and touching, a symbol of the Incarnation: Nec tamen quidquam inde maculæ contraxit, sed integer manens, sordes omnes nostras exhausit, et nos perfudit suâ sanctitate. H. de Sto. Victore: Lepram tetigit, et mundus permansit, quia veram humanitatis formam sumpsit, et culpam non contraxit.

[3] He touched the leper, says Theophylact, *δεικνὺς ὅτι ἡ ἁγία αὐτοῦ σὰρξ ἁγιασμοῦ μετεδίδου.*

And Jesus saith unto him, See thou tell no man' (cf. Matt. ix. 30; xii. 16; xvi. 20; xvii. 9; Mark iii. 12; v. 43; vii. 36; viii. 26; ix. 9; Luke viii. 56; ix. 21). St. Ambrose sees in this precept of silence an instruction of Christ to his people that, so far as may be, they withdraw from sight the good which they do; lest, he adds, they be themselves overtaken with a worse leprosy than any which they cure.[1] But hardly so. If the prohibition did not find its motive in the inner moral condition of the man, its more probable reason was, lest his own stiller ministry should be hindered by the untimely concourse of multitudes, drawn to Him in the hope of worldly benefits (as on this very occasion actually did occur, Mark i. 45); or in the expectation of seeing wonderful things;[2] or it might be, lest the enmity of his foes should be prematurely roused by the fame of his mighty deeds (John xi. 46, 47). But, as has been observed already (see pp. 191, 192), the injunction to one that he should proclaim, to another that he should conceal, the great things which God had wrought for him, had far more probably a deeper motive, and grounded itself on the different moral conditions of the persons healed. Grotius and Bengel suggest very plausibly that this '*See thou tell no man*' should be taken with this limitation—'till thou hast fulfilled that which I enjoin thee, that is, to *go thy way, show thyself to the priests, and offer the gift that Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them.*' Till this was accomplished, he should hold his peace; lest, if a rumour of these things went before him, the priests at Jerusalem, out of envy, out of a desire to depreciate what the Lord had wrought,

[1] *Exp. in Luc.* v. 5: Sed ne lepra transire possit in medicum, unusquisque Dominicæ humilitatis exemplo jactantiam vitet. Cur enim præcipitur nemini dicere, nisi ut doceret non vulganda nostra beneficia, sed premenda? So Chrysostom: Ἀτύφους ἡμᾶς παρασκευάζων καὶ ἀκενοδόξους.

[2] So Beza: Ne turba in solis miraculis obstupescens non satis ipsi spatii ad præcipuum illud sibi a Patre impositum munus obeundum, ad docendum videlicet, relinqueret. Compare Hammond on Matt. viii. 4.

might deny that the man had ever been a leper, or else that he was now truly cleansed.[1] We may thus account for the notice of St. Mark, '*He forthwith sent him away*,' or, '*put him forth*;' He would allow no lingering, but required him to hasten on his errand, lest a report of his cure should outrun him. '*For a testimony unto them*,' some understand, 'for a proof even to these gainsayers that I am come, not to destroy the Law, but to fulfil it (Matt. v. 17), not to dispel even a shadow, till I have brought in a substance in its room.[2] These Levitical offerings I still allow and uphold, while as yet that better offering, to which they point, has not been made.'[3] We should understand the words rather, '*for a testimony against them* (cf. Mark vi. 11; Luke ix. 5); for a witness against their unbelief, who refuse to give credence to Me, even while I legitimate my claims by such mighty works as these; works to the reality of which they will have set their own seal, accepting thy gift, re-admitting thee, as one truly cleansed, into the congregation'[4] (John v. 36; xv. 24). For his presenting himself before the priest had this object, that the priest might ascertain if indeed his leprosy was cleansed (Lev. xiv. 3), might in that case accept his gift,[5] and offer it as an atonement for him; and then,

[1] Thus the *Auct. Oper. Imperf.* (*Hom.* xxi.): Ideo eum jubet offerre munera, ut si postmodum vellent eum expellere, diceret eis: Munera quasi a mundato suscepistis, et quomodo me quasi leprosum expellitis? Si leprosus adhuc fui, munera accipere non debuistis quasi a mundato: si autem mundus factus sum, repellere non debetis quasi leprosum.

[2] So Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* iv. 9): Quantum enim ad gloriæ humanæ aversionem pertinebat, vetuit eum divulgare, quantum autem ad tutelam Legis, jussit ordinem impleri. Bengel: Ut testimonium illis exhibeatur, de Messiâ præsente, Legi non deroganti.

[3] Augustine (*Quæst. Evang.* ii. qu. 3): Quia nondum esse cœperat sacrificium sanctum sanctorum, quod corpus ejus est.

[4] Maldonatus: Ut inexcusabiles essent sacerdotes, si in ipsum non crederent, cujus miracula probâssent. Witsius (*De Mirac. Jesu*, i. p. 32): Idcirco addidit Jesus hæc a se ita juberi εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς, ne deinceps ullâ specie negari miraculum possit, et ut, dum eorum judicio approbatus, munus obtulisset, testimonium contra se haberent, impie se facere, quod Christo obluctarentur.

[5] Δῶρον is used for a *bloody* offering by the LXX, as Gen. iv. 4; Lev.

when all this was duly accomplished, *pronounce* him clean, and reinstate him in all his rights and privileges, ecclesiastical and civil, again.[1] On the healed leper's neglect of this command to keep silence, for instead of so doing, '*he went out, and began to publish it much, and to blaze abroad the matter*' (Mark i. 45), see what has been said already on a similar act of disobedience (page 214).

i. 2, 3, 10; cf. Matt. v. 23, Heb. viii. 3, where the δῶρα = δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίαι of the verse preceding, therefore also of ver. 1. Tertullian (*Adv. Marc* iv. 9) urges too much the notion of a *thank*-offering in this gift of the cleansed leper, which properly it was not, though the words are admirable, applied to such: Argumenta enim figurata utpote prophetatæ Legis adhuc in suis imaginibus tuebantur, quâ significabant hominem quondam peccatorem, verbo mox Dei emaculatum, offerre debere munus Deo apud templum, orationem scilicet et actionem gratiarum apud Ecclesiam, per Christum Jesum, catholicum Patris Sacerdotem.

[1] All the circumstances of the leper's cleansing yielded themselves so aptly to the scheme of Church satisfactions, as it gradually shaped itself in the Middle Ages, that it is nothing wonderful that it was used at least as an illustration, often as an argument. Yet even in those times we find the great truth, of Christ the only true Cleanser, often brought out as the most prominent. Thus by Gratian (*De Pœnit.* dist. i.): Ut Dominus ostenderet quod non sacerdotali judicio, sed largitate divinæ gratiæ peccator emundatur, leprosum tangendo mundavit, et postea sacerdoti sacrificium ex lege offerre præcepit. Leprosus enim tangitur, cum respectu divinæ pietatis mens peccatoris illustrata compungitur. . . . Leprosus semetipsum sacerdoti repræsentat, dum peccatum suum sacerdoti pœnitens confitetur. Sacrificium ex lege offert, dum satisfactionem Ecclesiæ judicio sibi impositam factis exsequitur. Sed antequam ad sacerdotem perveniat, emundatur, dum per contritionem cordis ante confessionem oris peccati veniâ indulgetur. Cf. Pet. Lombard (*Sent.* iv. dist. 18): Dominus leprosum sanitate prius per se restituit, deinde ad sacerdotes misit, quorum judicio ostenderetur mundatus. . . . Quia etsi aliquis apud Deum sit solutus, non tamen in facie Ecclesiæ solutus habetur, nisi per judicium sacerdotis. In solvendis ergo culpis vel retinendis ita operatur sacerdos evangelicus et judicat, sicut olim legalis in illis, qui contaminati erant leprâ, quæ peccatum signat.

11. *THE HEALING OF THE CENTURION'S SERVANT.*

MATT. viii. 5–13; LUKE vii. 1–10.

THERE has been occasion already to denounce the error of confounding this miracle of healing with that of the nobleman's son, recorded by St. John (iv. 46). But while we may not seek forcibly to reduce to a single story two narratives which record events entirely different, there is matter enough in the two reports of this miracle, the one by St. Matthew, the other by St. Luke, on which the harmonist may exercise his skill. According to the first Evangelist, the centurion comes a petitioner in his own person for the boon which he desires; according to the third, he sends others as intercessors and mediators between himself and the Lord, with other differences which necessarily follow and flow from this. Doubtless the latter is the more strictly literal account of the circumstances, as they actually came to pass; St. Matthew, who is briefer, telling it as though the centurion did in his own person, what, in fact, he did by the intervention of others—an exchange of persons of which all historical narrative and all the language of our common life are full.[1] A comparison of Mark x. 35 with Matt. xx. 23 will furnish another example of the same.

[1] Faustus the Manichæan uses these apparent divergences of the two narratives, with the greater fulness of one account than of the other, one saying that '*many shall come from the east and west, and sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of God*,' which is omitted in the other, to cast a suspicion upon both. The calumniator of the Old Covenant, he cannot endure to hear of the chiefs of that Covenant thus sitting down in the first places at the heavenly banquet. Augustine's

'*And when Jesus was entered into Capernaum, there came unto Him a centurion, beseeching Him, and saying, Lord, my servant lieth at home grievously tormented.*' This centurion, probably one of the Roman garrison of Capernaum, was by birth a heathen; but, like another of the same rank in the Acts (x. 1), like the eunuch under Candace (Acts viii. 27), like Lydia (Acts xvi. 14), was one of many who were at this time deeply feeling the emptiness and falsehood of all the polytheistic religions, and who had attached themselves by laxer or closer bonds, as proselytes of the gate, or proselytes of righteousness, to the congregation of Israel and the worship of Jehovah, finding in Judaism a satisfaction of some of the deepest needs of their souls, and a promise of the satisfaction of all.[1] He was one among the many who are distinguished from the seed of Abraham, yet described as 'fearing God,' or 'worshipping God,' of whom we read so often in the Acts (xiii. 43, 50; xvi. 14; xvii. 4, 17; xviii. 7), the proselytes, whom the providence of God had so wonderfully prepared in all the great cities of the Greek and Roman world as a link of communication between Gentile and Jew, in contact with both—holding to the first by their race, and to the last by their religion;

admirable reply contains much which has its application still, on the unfair way in which gainsayers find or make discrepancies where indeed there are none,—as though one narrator telling some detail, contradicts another, who passes over that detail,—one ascribing to some person an act, contradicts another who states more particularly that he did it by the agency of another. All that we demand, he says, is, that men should be as fair to Scripture as to any other historic document; should suffer it to speak to men as they are wont to speak to one another (*Con. Faust.* xxxiii. 7, 8): Quid ergo, cum legimus, obliviscimur quemadmodum loqui soleamus? An Scriptura Dei aliter nobiscum fuerat quam nostro more locutura? Cf. *De Cons. Evang.* ii. 20.

[1] Remarkably enough all the Roman centurions who figure in the sacred narrative are honourably mentioned; thus, besides these two, the centurion who watched by the cross of Christ, and exclaimed, 'Truly this was the Son of God' (Matt. xxvii. 54; Luke xxiii. 47): and Julius, who so courteously entreated Paul on his way to Rome (Acts xxvii. 3, 43). Probably, in the general wreck of the moral institutions of the heathen world, the Roman army was one of the few in which some of the old virtues survived.

and who must have materially helped to the early spread of the faith and to the ultimate coalescence of Gentile and Jew in one Christian Church.

But with the higher matters which he had learned from his intercourse with the people of the Covenant, he had learned this, that all heathens, all 'sinners of the Gentiles,' were 'without;' that there was a middle wall of partition between them and the children of the stock of Abraham; that they were to worship only as in the outer court, and not presume to draw near to the holy place. And thus, as we learn from St. Luke (vii. 3), he did not himself approach, but '*when he heard of Jesus, he sent unto Him the elders of the Jews, beseeching Him that He would come and heal his servant*,' a servant who '*was dear unto him*,'[1] but who now '*was sick and ready to die*.' The Jewish elders executed their commission with fidelity and zeal, pleading for him as for one whose affection for the chosen people, and active well-doing in their behalf, had merited this return of favour: '*They besought Him instantly, saying that he was worthy for whom He should do this; for he loveth our nation, and he hath built us a synagogue*;' or as we might translate, giving full force to the words of the original, '*and hath himself built us a synagogue*'—he and no other. Nor did they plead in vain. '*Jesus went with them*.'

But presently even this request seemed to the maker of it too bold. In his true and ever-deepening humility he counted it a presumption to have asked, though by the intervention of others, the presence under his roof of one so highly exalted. '*And when He was now not far from the house, the centurion sent friends to Him, saying unto Him, Lord, trouble not Thyself: for I am not worthy that Thou*

[1] Calvin: Lucas hoc modo dubitationem prævenit, quæ subire poterat lectorum animos: scimus enim, non habitos fuisse servos eo in pretio, ut de ipsorum vitâ tam anxii essent domini, nisi qui singulari industriâ vel fide vel aliâ virtute sibi gratiam acquisierant. Significat ergo Lucas non vulgare fuisse sordidumque mancipium, sed fidelem et raris dotibus ornatum servum qui eximiâ gratiâ apud dominum polleret; hinc tanta illius vitæ cura et tam studiosa commendatio.

shouldest enter under my roof.' It was not merely that he, a heathen, might claim no near access to the King of Israel; but there was, no doubt, beneath this and mingling with this, a lively sense of his own personal unworthiness, of his unfitness for a close communion with a holy being. And thus, in Augustine's words, 'counting himself unworthy that Christ should enter into his doors, he was counted worthy that Christ should enter into his heart'[1]—a far better boon; for Christ sat down in the houses of many, as of that proud self-righteous Pharisee (Luke vii. 36; cf. xiv. 1); whose hearts for all this were not the less empty of his presence. But this centurion received *Him* in his heart, whom he did not receive in his house.[2] And, indeed, every little trait of his character, as it appears in the sacred narrative, points him out as one in whom the seed of God's word would find the ready soil of a good and honest heart. For, not to speak of those prime graces, faith and humility, which so eminently shone forth in him,—the affection which he had won from those Jewish elders, the zeal which had stirred him to build a house for the worship of the true God, his anxiety about a slave,—one so commonly excluded from all earnest human sympathies that even a Cicero apologizes for feeling deeply the death of such a one in his household,[3]—all these traits of character combine to present him to us as one of those 'children of God' scattered abroad in the world, whom the Son of God came that He might gather into the fellowship of his Church (John xi. 52).

[1] *Serm.* lxii. 1: Dicendo se indignum præstitit dignum, non in cujus parietes, sed in cujus cor Christus intraret. Neque hoc diceret cum tantâ fide et humilitate, nisi illum quem timebat intrare in domum suam, corde gestaret. Nam non erat magna felicitas si Dominus Jesus intraret in parietes ejus et non esset in pectore ejus (Luke vii. 36).

[2] Augustine (*Serm.* lxxvii. 8): Tecto non recipiebat, corde receperat. Quanto humilior, tanto capacior, tanto plenior. Colles enim aquam repellunt, valles implentur.

[3] In a letter to his friend Atticus (i. 12). See too the noble things on the sympathy which ought to exist in their joys and their sorrows between masters and servants, in the *Medea* of Euripides (54–59).

'*But say in a word, and my servant shall be healed.*' The manner is very noteworthy in which the Roman officer, by help of an analogy drawn from the circle of things with which he himself is most familiar, by a comparison borrowed from his own military experience,[1] proceeds to make easier to himself this act of his faith. He knows that Christ's *word*, without his actual presence, will be sufficient; there is that in his own experience which assures him as much; for, he adds, '*I am a man under authority, having soldiers under me: and I say to this man, Go, and he goeth; and to another, Come, and he cometh; and to my servant, Do this, and he doeth it.*' It is an argument from the less to the greater. He contemplates the relation of Christ to the spiritual kingdom in an aspect as original as it is grand. The Lord presents Himself to him as the true Cæsar and *Imperator*, the highest over the military hierarchy, not of earth, but of heaven (Col i. 16). 'I am,' he would say, 'one occupying only a subordinate place, set *under authority*, a subaltern, with tribunes and commanders over me. Yet, notwithstanding, those that are under me, obey me; I bid them go hither and thither, and they fulfil my bidding, so that, myself sitting still, I can yet accomplish the things which I desire (Acts x. 8; xxiii. 23). How much more Thou, not set, as I am, in a subordinate position, but who art as a Prince over the host of heaven,[2] with Angels and Spirits to obey thy word and run swiftly

[1] Bengel: Sapientia fidelis ex ruditate militari pulchre elucens.

[2] The στρατιὰ οὐράνιος (Luke ii. 13; cf. Rev. xix. 14). How true a notion this indeed was, which in his simple faith the centurion had conceived for himself, we see from those words of our Lord, 'Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and He shall presently give Me more than twelve legions of angels' (Matt. xxvi. 53)? Jerome (in loc.): Volens ostendere Dominum quoque non per adventum tantum corporis, sed per angelorum ministeria posse implere quod vellet. Fuller (*Pisgah Sight of Palestine*, vol. i. p. 109) takes it a little differently—'Concluding from his own authority over his soldiers, that Christ, by a more absolute power, as Lord High Marshal of all maladies, without his personal presence, could by his bare word of command order any disease to march or retreat at his pleasure.'

at thy command, canst fulfil from a distance all the good pleasure of thy will. There is then no need that Thou shouldest come to my house; only commission one of these genii of healing, who will execute speedily the errand of grace and power on which Thou shalt send him.'[1]

In all this there was so wonderful a union of faith and humility, that it is nothing strange to read that the Lord Himself was filled with admiration: '*When Jesus heard it, He marvelled,*[2] *and said to them that followed, Verily, I say*

[1] Severus (in Cramer's *Catena*): Εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼ στρατιώτης ὤν, καὶ ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν βασιλέως τελῶν, τοῖς δορυφόροις ἐντέλλομαι, πῶς οὐ μᾶλλον αὐτὸς ὁ τῶν ἄνω καὶ ἀγγελικῶν δυνάμεων ποιητής, ὃ θέλεις ἐρεῖς καὶ γενήσεται; and Augustine (*Enarr. in Ps.* xlvi. 9, and *Serm.* lxii. 2): Si ergo ego, inquit, homo sub potestate, jubendi habeo potestatem, quid tu possis, cui omnes serviunt potestates? And Bernard more than once urges this as a singular feature of his humility; thus *Ep.* cccxcii.: O prudens et vere corde humilis anima! dicturus quod prælatus esset militibus, repressit extollentiam confessione subjectionis: immo præmisit subjectionem, ut pluris sibi esset quod suberat, quam quod præerat; and beautifully, *De Off. Episc.* 8: Non jactabat potestatem, quam nec solam protulit, nec priorem. . . . . Præmissa siquidem est humilitas, ne altitudo præcipitet. Nec enim locum invenit arrogantia, ubi tam clarum humilitatis insigne præcesserat. Such explanation appears preferable to theirs who make ἄνθρωπος ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν, a man *in* authority. Rettig (*Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1838, p. 472), reading with Lachmann, ἄνθρ. ὑπὸ ἐξουσ. τασσόμενος (which last word, however, should find no place in the text), has an ingenious but untenable explanation in this sense. The *Auct. Oper. Imperf.* interprets rightly ἄνθρωπος ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν, a man in a subordinate position; but then will not allow, nay rather expressly denies, that this is a comparison by way of contrast, which the centurion is drawing,—that he is magnifying the Lord's *highest* place by comparing it with his own only subordinate, but that rather he is *in all things* likening the one to the other: 'As I am under worldly authorities, and yet have those whom I may send, so Thou, albeit under thine heavenly Father, hast yet a heavenly host at thy bidding.' (Ego sum homo sub potestate alterius, tamen habeo potestatem jubendi eis qui sub me sunt. Nec enim impedior jubere minores, propter quod ipse sum sub majoribus; sed ab illis quidem jubeor, sub quibus sum; illis autem jubeo, qui sub me sunt: sic et tu, quamvis sub potestate Patris sis, secundum quod homo es, habes tamen potestatem jubendi angelis tuis, nec impediris jubere inferioribus, propter quod ipse habes superiorem.) This interpretation, though capable of a fair meaning, probably expresses the Arian tendencies of the author.

[2] But since all wonder properly so called, arises from the meeting with something unexpected and hitherto unknown, how could the Lord, to whom all things were known, be said to marvel? To this some have

unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel.'[1] Where faith is, there will be the kingdom of God; so that this saying already contains a warning to his Jewish hearers, of the danger they are in of forfeiting blessings whereof others are showing themselves worthier than they.[2] But the words which follow are far more explicit: '*And I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and west,*' that is, from the ends of the earth (Isai. xlv. 6; Mal. i. 11); '*and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven,*' shall be partakers of the heavenly festival, which shall be at the inauguration of the kingdom (Isai. xxv. 6; Luke xiv. 16; Rev. xix. 9, 17); '*but the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth*;' or, worse than this, '*the weeping and gnashing of teeth*;' that which is the allotted portion of these (Matt. viii. 42, 50; xxii. 13; xxiv. 51; xxv. 30). In other words, the kingdom should be taken from them, 'and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof' (Matt. xxi. 43); because of their unbelief, they, the natural branches of the olive tree, should be broken off, and the wild olive should be

answered that Christ did not so much Himself wonder, as commend to us that which was worthy of our admiration. Thus Augustine (*De Gen. Con. Man.* i. 8): Quod mirabatur Dominus, nobis mirandum esse significabat; and he asks in another place (*Con. Adv. Leg. et Proph.* i. 7), how should not He have known before the measure of that faith, which He Himself had created? (An vero alius eam in corde centurionis operabatur, quam ipse qui mirabatur?) Yet a solution like this brings an unreality into parts of our Lord's conduct, as though He did some things for show and the effect which they would have on others, instead of all his actions being the truthful exponents of his own innermost being. On the other hand, to say that according to his human nature He might have been ignorant of some things, seems to threaten a Nestorian severance of the Person of Christ. But the whole subject of the *communicatio idiomatum*, with its precipices on either side, is one of the hardest in the whole domain of theology. See Aquinas, *Sum. Theol.* 3ª, qu. 15, art. 8; and Gerhard, *Locc. Theoll.* iv. 2, 4.

[1] Augustine: In olivâ non inveni, quod inveni in oleastro. Ergo oliva superbiens præcidatur; oleaster humilis inseratur. Vide inserentem, vide præcidentem. Cf. *In Joh. tract.* xvi. ad finem.

[2] Augustine: Alienigenæ carne, domestici corde.

grafted in (Rom. xi. 17–24; Acts xiii. 46; xix. 9; xxviii. 28; Matt. iii. 9).

'*And Jesus said unto the centurion*,' or to him in his messengers, '*Go thy way, and as thou hast believed*,[1] *so be it done unto thee. And his servant was healed in the self-same hour*;'—not merely was there an abatement of the violence of the disease, but it left him altogether (John iv. 52; Matt. viii. 15). There is a certain difficulty in defining the exact character of the sickness from which he was thus graciously delivered. Of every form of palsy it could not be said that those taken by it are '*grievously tormented*,' or that they are '*ready to die*.' But paralysis with contraction of the muscles is accompanied with intense suffering, and, when united, as it much oftener is in the hot climates of the East and of Africa than among us, with tetanus, both '*grievously torments*,' and rapidly brings on dissolution.[2]

[1] Bernard (*Serm.* iii. *De Annâ*): Oleum misericordiæ in vase fiduciæ ponit.

[2] At 1 Macc. ix. 55, 56, it is said of Alcimus, who was 'taken with a palsy,' that he died presently 'with great torment' (*μετα βασάνου μεγάλης* = *δεινῶς βασανιζόμενος* here; cf. Winer, *Realwörterbuch*, s. v. *Paralytische*). In St. Matthew and St. Mark these paralytics are always *παραλυτικοί*, in St. Luke's Gospel, as in the Acts, *παραλελυμένοι*.

12. *THE DEMONIAC IN THE SYNAGOGUE OF CAPERNAUM.*

Mark i. 23–27; Luke iv. 33–36.

THE healing of this demoniac, the second miracle of the kind which the Evangelists record at any length, may not offer so much remarkable as some other works of a like character, but not the less has its own features of interest. What distinguishes it the most is the testimony which the evil spirit bears to Christ, and *his* refusal to accept it; though this circumstance is not without its parallels elsewhere (Matt. viii. 29; Mark i. 34). This history thus stands in very instructive relation with another in the Acts (xvi. 16–18). There in like manner, a damsel possessed with a spirit of divination bears witness to Paul and his company, 'These men are the servants of the most high God, which show unto us the way of salvation;' and the servant there, as little as the Master here, endures that hell should bear witness to heaven, the kingdom of darkness accept a testimony from the kingdom of light.

Our Lord was teaching, as was his wont upon a Sabbath (cf. Luke iv. 16; Acts xiii. 14, 15), in the synagogue of Capernaum; and the people now, as on other similar occasions (see Matt. vii. 29; Mark i. 22; xi. 18), '*were astonished at his doctrine, for his word was with power.*' But He was not mighty in word only, but also in work; and it was ordained by the providence of his Heavenly Father, that the opportunity should here be offered Him for confirming his word with signs following. '*There was in their synagogue a man with an unclean spirit*;' or, as St. Luke

describes it, '*with the spirit of an unclean devil*;' but not therefore excluded from the public worship of God any more than another in like condition, of whom we have mention at Luke xiii. 16; and this spirit felt at once the nearness of One who was stronger than all that kingdom whereto he belonged; of One whose mission it was to destroy the works of the devil. And with the instinct and consciousness of this danger which so nearly threatened his usurped dominion, he cried out,—not the man himself, but the evil spirit,—'*saying, Let us alone:*[1] *what have we to do with Thee, Thou Jesus of Nazareth?*[2] *art Thou come to destroy us?*' (cf. Matt. viii. 29; 2 Pet. ii. 4; Jude 6). '*I know Thee who Thou art, the Holy One of God.*' Earth has not recognized her king, disguised as He is like one of her own children; but heaven has borne witness to Him (Luke ii. 11; iii. 22; Matt. iii. 17), and now hell must bear its witness too; 'the devils believe and tremble.' The unholy, which is resolved to be unholy still, understands well that its death-knell has sounded, when '*the Holy One of God*' (cf. Ps. xvi. 10) has come to make war against it.

But what, it may be asked, could have been the motive to this testimony thus borne? It is strange that the evil spirit should, without compulsion, proclaim to the world the presence in its midst of the Holy One of God, of Him who should thus bring all the unholy, all on which he battened and by which he lived, to an end. Might we not rather expect that he should have denied, or sought to obscure, the glory of the Lord's person? It cannot be replied that this was an unwilling confession to

[1] Ἔα, not the imperative of ἐάω, but an interjection of terror, wrung out by the φοβερὰ ἐκδοχὴ κρίσεως (Heb. x. 27),—unless indeed the interjection was originally this imperative. So Godet: Laisse! c'est un cri semblable à celui d'un malfaiteur, qui tout à coup appréhendé par un gendarme s'écrierait, Lâche-moi.

[2] Ναζαρηνός here, and Mark xiv. 67; xvi. 6. The word appears in the New Testament in two other forms, Ναζαραῖος (Matt. ii. 23; xxvi. 71; John xviii. 7), and Ναζωραῖος (Mark x. 47, and often).

the truth, forcibly extorted by Christ's superior power, seeing that it displeased Him in whose favour it professed to be borne, and this so much that He at once stopped the mouth of the utterer.[1] It remains then either, with Theophylact and Grotius, to understand this as the cry of abject and servile fear, that with fawning and flatteries would fain avert from itself the doom which with Christ's presence in the world must evidently be near;—to compare, as Jerome does, this exclamation to that of the fugitive slave, dreaming of nothing but stripes and torments when he encounters unawares his well-known lord, and now seeking by any means to deprecate his anger;[2]—or else to regard this testimony as intended only to injure in the world's estimation Him in whose favour it is rendered. There was hope that the truth itself might be brought into suspicion and discredit, thus receiving attestation from the spirit of lies;[3] and these confessions of Jesus as the Christ may have been meant to traverse and mar his work, even as we see Mark iii. 22 following hard on Mark iii. 11. The fact that Christ would not allow this testimony, that He '*rebuked him, saying, Hold thy peace, and come out of him*,'[4] goes some way to render

[1] Φιμώθητι, cf. Matt. xxii. 12; and for the word used in its literal sense, 1 Cor. ix. 9.

[2] Grotius: Vult Jesum blanditiis demulcere, cui se certando imparem erat expertus. Jerome (*Comm. in Matt.* ix.): Velut si servi fugitivi post multum temporis dominum suum videant; nihil aliud nisi de verberibus deprecantur.

[3] Thus, with a slight difference, Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* iv. 7): Increpuit eum Jesus, plane ut invidiosum et in ipsâ confessione petulantem et male adulantem, quasi hæc esset summa gloria Christi, si ad perditionem dæmonum venisset, et non potius ad hominum salutem.

[4] Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* iv. 8): Illius erat, præconium immundi spiritûs respuere, cui Sancti abundabant. Calvin: Duplex potest esse ratio, cur loqui non sineret: una generalis, quod nondum maturum plenæ revelationis tempus advenerat; altera specialis, quod illos repudiabat præcones ac testes suæ divinitatis, qui laude suâ nihil aliud quam maculam, et sinistram opinionem aspergere illi poterant. Atque hæc posterior indubia est, quia testatum oportuit esse hostile dissidium, quod habebat æternæ salutis et vitæ auctor cum mortis principe ejusque ministris.

this the preferable explanation. Angel and Apostle might rebuke in the name of another (Jude 9; Acts xvi. 18), Christ rebukes in his own.

But was his word in the present instance that word of power we might justly expect? Christ has bidden the evil spirit to hold his peace, and yet only after '*he had torn him, and cried with a loud voice, he came out of him*' (cf. Acts viii. 7). But in truth he *was* obedient to this command of silence; he did not *speak* any more, and that was what our Lord forbade; this loud cry was nothing but an inarticulate utterance of rage and pain. Neither is there any contradiction between St. Luke, who reports that the evil spirit '*hurt him not*,' and St. Mark, who describes him as having '*torn him*.' He did him no permanent injury; what harm he could work, this he did; St. Luke himself reporting that he cast him on the ground; with which the language of the second Evangelist, that he threw him into strong convulsions, in fact consents. We have at Mark ix. 26 (cf. Luke ix 42) an analogous case, although there a paroxysm more violent still accompanies the going out of the unclean spirit; for what the devil cannot keep as his own, he will, if he can, destroy: even as Pharaoh never treated the children of Israel so ill as then when they were just escaping from his grasp. Something similar is evermore finding place; and Satan tempts, plagues, and buffets none so fiercely as those who are in the act of being delivered from his tyranny for ever.

St. Mark never misses an opportunity of recording the profound impression which Christ's miracles made on those that witnessed them,—the astonishment with which these were filled (v. 20; vi. 51; vii. 37; x. 26). He lays nowhere greater emphasis on this than here: '*And they were all amazed, insomuch that they questioned among themselves, saying, What thing is this? what new doctrine is this? for with authority commandeth He even the unclean spirits, and they do obey Him.*'

13. *THE HEALING OF SIMON'S WIFE'S MOTHER.*

Matt. viii. 14–17; Mark i. 29–31; Luke iv. 38–40.

THIS miracle is by St. Mark and St. Luke linked immediately, and in a manner that marks historic connexion, with that which has just come under our notice. Thus St. Mark: '*And forthwith when they were come out of the synagogue, they entered into the house of Simon and Andrew.*' In St. Luke it is only '*Simon's house.*'[1] His stronger personality, as we may suppose, causes Andrew to fall into the background, though in all likelihood with natural prerogatives, as an elder brother, and certainly with spiritual, as the earlier called and the bringer of his brother to Jesus. It was probably to eat bread that the Lord on this Sabbath day entered into that house. '*And when Jesus was come into Peter's house, He saw his wife's mother laid and sick of a fever,*'—'*of a great fever,*' as St. Luke informs us, the physician in all probability using this epithet in its technical sense, and not merely to express the intensity of the fever which had visited her. This is made likely by the fact that in the medical language of the day there were 'great' fevers, these corresponding to our typhus, and 'little' fevers; just as French physicians

[1] Maldonatus is greatly troubled that Peter, who before this had 'left all,' should be supposed to have a house, militating, as this would do, against the perfection of his state. His explanation and that of most Roman Catholic expositors is, that this house *had been* Peter's, but had been made over by him to his wife's mother, when he determined to follow Christ in the absolute renunciation of all things. The explanation is needless; the renunciation was entire in will (see Matt. xix. 27), and ready in act to be carried out into all its details, as the necessity arose.

writing on epilepsy, distinguish between the 'grand' mal and the 'petit' mal.[1] It is St. Luke also who alone mentions the intercession of some on her behalf; '*they besought Him for her*;' though as much perhaps is implied in St. Mark's '*anon they tell Him of her*.' Again it is to St. Luke that we owe the graphic touch, '*He stood over her*,' and the very noticeable phrase, '*He rebuked the fever*,' as on another occasion, '*He rebuked the winds and the sea*' (viii. 24). To the other Evangelists he leaves to record that '*He touched her hand*' (cf. Dan. x. 15; Rev. i. 17; Luke vii. 14; viii. 54), or '*took her by the hand and lifted her up*.' From that life-giving touch health and strength flowed into her wasted frame; '*the fever left her*,' and left her not in that state of extreme weakness and exhaustion which fever usually leaves behind, when in the ordinary course of things it has abated;[2] not slowly convalescent; but cured so perfectly that '*immediately she arose, and ministered unto them*' (cf. John iv. 52),—providing for those present what was necessary for their entertainment;—a pattern, it has been often observed, to all restored to spiritual health, that they should use this strength in ministering to Christ and to his people.[3]

The fame of this miracle, following close upon another wrought on the same day, spread so rapidly, that '*when the even was come*,' or '*when the sun did set*,' as St. Mark

[1] See Galen, *De Diff. Febr.* 1, and some good observations in Belcher's *Our Lord's Miracles of Healing*, pp. 17–30. The strictly medical ὑδρωπικός, I may add, he alone makes use of.

[2] Jerome (*Comm. in Matt.* in loc.) observes this: Natura hominum istiusmodi est, ut post febrim magis lassescant corpora, et incipiente sanitate ægrotationis mala sentiant. Verum sanitas quæ confertur a Domino totum simul reddit, nec sufficit esse sanatam, sed ut ἐπίτασις fortitudinis indicetur, additum est, Et surrexit et ministrabat eis. Bengel: Officio matris-familias fungebatur, sanitatis veræ signo læto.

[3] Gerhard (*Harm. Evang.* 38): Simul vero docemur, quando spiritualiter sanati sumus, ut membra nostra præbeamus arma justitiæ Dei [Deo ?] et ipsi serviamus in justitiâ et sanctitate coram ipso, inservientes proximo, et membris Christi sicut hæc muliercula Christo et discipulis ministrat.

has it, '*they brought unto Him many that were possessed with devils; and He cast out the spirits with his word, and healed all that were sick.*' There are two explanations of this little circumstance, by all three Evangelists carefully recorded, that not till the sun was setting or had actually set they brought their sick to Jesus. Hammond and Olshausen suggest, that they waited till the heat of the middle day, which these were ill able to bear, was past, and brought them in the cool of the evening. Others assume that this day being a Sabbath (cf. Mark i. 21, 29, 32), they were unwilling to violate its sacred rest; which in their own esteem they would have done, bringing out their sick before the close of that day, that is, before sunset. Thus Chrysostom, on one occasion,[1] although on another he sees here more generally an evidence of the faith and eagerness of the people, who, even when the day was spent, still came streaming to Christ, and laying their sick before Him that they might be healed.

All this found place, as St. Matthew tells us, '*that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses.*' Not a few have seized on this '*that it might be fulfilled*' as a proof that St. Matthew did not see any reference in the passage which he cites from Isaiah (liii. 4) to the vicarious and atoning work of the Christ; and even allowing that there was there a prophecy of Him as a remover of the world's woe, yet not as Himself coming under that woe that so He might remove it. Few will, I suppose, at this day deny that such a sense lies in the original words of Isaiah, that his 'took' is not merely 'removed,' nor his 'bare,' 'bare away;'[2] his image being rather that of one who, withdrawing a crushing burden from the shoulder of

[1] In Cramer, *Catena*, vol. i. p. 278.

[2] Tertullian indeed so quotes the words from his old Latin version (*Adv. Marc.* iii. 17): Ipse enim imbecillitates nostras *abstulit*, et languores portavit: but the Vulgate more correctly, Vere languores nostros ipse *tulit*, et dolores nostros ipse portavit.

another, submits it to his own. But this interpretation of the words, so distinctly vindicated for them by St. Peter (1 Pet. ii. 24), St. Matthew in no way denies. That '*Himself*' with which he commences his citation, implying as it does a reaction in some shape or other of the cures wrought, upon Him who wrought them, is decisive upon this point; not to say that the two verbs which he uses[1] refuse to lend themselves to any other interpretation. Doubtless there is a difficulty, or difficulties rather, for there are two, about this citation—the first, why St. Matthew should bring it at all into connexion with the healing of the bodily diseases of men; and the second, how there should have been any more real fulfilment of it herein, than in every other part of the earthly ministry of Christ. The first of these difficulties is easily disposed of. The connexion, above all as traced in Scripture, is so intimate between sin and suffering, death (and disease is death beginning) is so directly the consequence of sin, all the weight of woe which rests upon the world is in one sense so distinctly penal, that the Messiah might be regarded equally as in his proper work, as fulfilling the prophecies which went before concerning Him, whether He were removing the sin, or removing the sickness, sorrow, pain, which are the results of the sin, dealing with the disorder of our moral being or of our physical.

The other question is one of a more real embarrassment. The words of St. Matthew, as of the prophet from whom he draws them, certainly imply, as we have seen, an assuming upon the Lord's part of the sicknesses and infirmities from which He delivered others. But how could this be? In what true sense could He be affirmed to bear the sicknesses, or Himself to take the infirmities, which He healed? Did He not rather abolish, and remove them altogether? It is, no doubt, a perfectly scriptural assertion, that Christ was the *κάθαρμα*, the *φάρμακον*, the

[1] Ἔλαβε, ἐβάστασε.

piaculum, who should draw to Himself and absorb all the evils of the world, in whom they should all meet, that so in Him they should all be done away; yet He did not *become* this through the healing of diseases, any more than through any other isolated acts of his earthly ministry. We can understand his being said in his death and passion to have come Himself under the burden of those sufferings and pains from which He released others; but how can this be affirmed of Him when engaged in works of beneficent activity? Then He was rather chasing away diseases and pains altogether, than Himself undertaking them.

An explanation has found favour with many, suggested by the fact that his labours this day did not end with the day, but reached far into the evening;—so that He removed, indeed, sicknesses from others, but with painfulness to Himself, and with the weariness attendant upon toils unseasonably drawn out; and thus may not unfitly be said to have taken those sicknesses on Himself.[1] Olshausen adopts, though in somewhat more spiritual a manner, this explanation. The obscurity of the passage, he says, only disappears when we learn to think more *really* of the healing activity of Christ, as an actual outstreaming and outbreathing of the fulness of his inner life. As therefore physical exertion physically wearied Him (John iv. 6), so did spiritual activity long drawn out spiritually exhaust Him; and this exhaustion, as all other forms of suffering,

[1] So Woltzogen, whom, despite his Socinian tendencies, here Witsius (*Meletem. Leidens.* p. 402) quotes with approbation: Adeo ut locus hic prophetæ bis fuerit adimpletus; semel cum Christus corporis morbos abstulit ab hominibus non sine summâ molestiâ ac defatigatione, dum ad vesperam usque circa ægrorum curationem occupatus, quodammodo ipsas hominum ægritudines in se recipiebat. . . . Alterâ vice, cum suis perpessionibus ac morte spiritualiter morbos nostrorum peccatorum a nobis sustulit. Cf. Grotius, in loc. Theophylact had led the way to this explanation, finding an emphasis in the fact that the sick were brought to Jesus *in the evening*, out of season (παρὰ καιρόν), though he does not bring that circumstance into connexion with these words of Isaiah.

He underwent for our sakes. The statement is questionable in doctrine: moreover, I cannot believe that the Evangelist meant to lay any such stress upon the unusual or prolonged labours of this day, or would not as freely have cited these words in relating any other cures which the Lord performed. Not this day only, even had it been a day of especial weariness, but every day of his earthly life was a coming under, upon his part, those evils which He removed from others. For that which is the law of all true helping, namely, that the burden which you would lift, you must yourself stoop to and come under (Gal. vi. 2), the grief which you would console, you must yourself feel with,—a law which we witness to as often as we use the words 'sympathy' and 'compassion,'—was truest of all in Him upon whom the help of all was laid.[1] Not in this single aspect of his life, namely, that He was a healer of sicknesses, were these words of the prophet fulfilled, but rather in the life itself, which brought Him in contact with the thousand forms of want and woe, of discord in man's outward life, of discord in man's inner being. Every one of these, as a real consequence of sin, and at every moment contemplated by Him as such, pressed with a living pang into the holy soul of the Lord (John xi. 33, 35). St. Matthew quotes these words in reference to one day of our Lord's work upon earth; but we only enter into their full force when we recognize that, eminently true of that day,—and here we may fitly urge its long and exhausting toils,—they were also true of all other days, and of all other aspects of that ministry which He came into the world to fulfil. He bore these sicknesses, inasmuch as He bore that mortal suffering life, in which alone He could bring them to an end, and finally swallow up death, and all that led to death, in victory.

[1] Hilary (in loc.): Passione corporis sui infirmitates humanæ imbecillitatis absorbens. Schoettgen (*Hor. Heb.* in loc.) has a remarkable quotation to the same effect from the book Sohar.

14. *THE RAISING OF THE WIDOW'S SON.*

LUKE vii. 11–16.

ST. LUKE is the only Evangelist who tells of more than one whom the Lord raised from the dead. St. Matthew and St. Mark tell us only of Jairus' daughter; St. John only of Lazarus. St. Luke, recording the first of these miracles in common with the two earlier Evangelists, has this one which is peculiarly his own. '*And it came to pass the day after that He went into a city called Nain; and many of his disciples went with Him, and much people.*' That healing of the centurion's servant at a distance and with a word was no doubt a great miracle; but '*the day after*' was to see a far mightier and more wonderful work even than this. Nain is not mentioned elsewhere in Scripture; nor is it to be confounded with a Nain, mentioned by Josephus,[1] and found on the other side of Jordan. It lay upon the southern border of Galilee, and on the road to Jerusalem, whither our Lord was probably now going to keep the second passover of his open ministry. Dean Stanley points out its exact position, and even the spot where this mighty work must have been wrought: 'On the northern slope of the rugged and barren ridge of Little Hermon, immediately west of Endor, which lies in a further recess of the same range, is the ruined village of Nain. No convent, no tradition, marks the spot. But, under these circumstances, the name is sufficient to guarantee its authenticity. One entrance

[1] *B. J.* iv. 9. 7.

alone it could have had—that which opens on the rough hill-side in its downward slope to the plain. It must have been in this steep descent, as, according to Eastern custom, they "carried out the dead man," that "nigh to the gate" of the village, the bier was stopped, and the long procession of mourners stayed, and "the young man delivered back" to his mother.'[1]

'*Now when He came nigh to the gate of the city, behold, there was a dead man carried out,*[2] *the only son of his mother, and she was a widow; and much people of the city was with her.*' It was thus ordained in the providence of God that the witnesses of this miracle should be many; the '*much people*' that were with the Lord, in addition to the '*much people*' which accompanied the funeral procession. The circumstance of his meeting this at '*the gate of the city*,' while it belonged to the wonder-works of God's grace, being one of those coincidences which, seeming accidental, are yet deep laid in the councils of his providence, is at the same time a natural incident, and is accounted for by the fact that the Jews did not suffer to inter the dead among the living, but buried them without the walls of their cities. 'The rock-hewn sepulchres on the hill-side may well be as old as the time of Christ, and it is probably to one of them that the youth's body was being carried.'[3] Even they who were touched with no such lively sense of human sorrows as was He who made all sorrows his own, might have been moved and doubtless were moved to compassion here. Indeed, it would be hard to render the picture of desolation more complete than in two strokes the Evangelist has made it, whose whole narrative here, apart from its deeper interest, is a master-work for its perfect beauty.[4] The bitterness of the mourning for

[1] *Sinai and Palestine*, p. 349.

[2] This use of ἐκκομίζειν is found in Xenophon; but the more technical word is ἐκφέρειν, and for the carrying out, ἐκφορά.

[3] Farrar, *Life of Christ*, vol. i. p. 285.

[4] Gregory of Nyssa, himself a great master of narration, but in a

an only son had passed into a proverb; thus compare Jer. vi. 26: 'Make thee mourning as for an only son, most bitter lamentation;' Zech. xii. 10: 'They shall mourn for Him as one mourneth for his only son;' and Amos viii. 10: 'I will make it as the mourning of an only son.' And as this mourning, so not less the desolation of a widow (Ruth i. 20, 21; 1 Tim. v. 5; Job xxiv. 3).

'*And when the Lord*[1] *saw her, He had compassion on her, and said unto her, Weep not.*' How different this '*Weep not*,' from the idle 'Weep not,' which so often proceeds from the lips of earthly comforters, who, even while they thus speak, give no sufficient reason why the mourner should cease from weeping. But He who came down from heaven, one day to make good that word, 'God shall wipe away *all* tears from their eyes, and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain' (Rev. xxi. 4), shows now some effectual glimpses and presages of his power; wiping away, though as yet it may not be for ever, the tears from the weeping eyes of that desolate mother. At the same time, as Olshausen has observed, we must not suppose that compassion for the mother was the *determining* motive for this mighty spiritual act on the part of Christ: for then, had the joy of the mother been the only object which He intended, the young man who was raised would have been used merely as a *means*, which no man can ever be. The joy of the mother was indeed the nearest consequence of the act, but not the final cause;—*that*, though at present hidden, was, no doubt, the spiritual awakening of the

more artificial and elaborate style, has called attention to this (*De Hom. Opific.* c. 25): Πολλὰ δι' ὀλίγων διηγεῖται ἡ ἱστορία· θρῆνος ἄντικρύς ἐστι τὸ διήγημα· . . . . ὁρᾷς τὸ βαρος τῆς συμφορᾶς, πῶς ἐν ὀλίγῳ τὸ πάθος ὁ λόγος ἐξετραγῴδησε.

[1] Godet: L'expression, Le Seigneur, ne se rencontre guères dans nos Évangiles que chez Luc, et de préférence dans les morceaux qui lui sont propres: x. 1; xi. 39; xii. 42; xiii. 15; xvii. 5, 6; xviii. 6; xxii. 31, 61.

young man for a higher life, through which alone the joy of the mother could become true and abiding.

'*And He came and touched the bier.*'[1] The intimation was rightly interpreted by those for whom it was intended; '*and they that bare him stood still.*' Then follows the word of power: '*Young man, I say unto thee, Arise.*' It is spoken, as in every instance, in his own name,[2]—'I, who am the Prince of life, who have the keys of death and the grave, quickening the dead, and calling those things which are not, as though they were, bid thee to live.' And that word of his was potent in the kingdom of death; '*he that was dead sat up*,' no need of other hands to raise him now, '*and began to speak.*' Christ raises from the bier as easily as another from the bed,[3]—herein putting a difference between Himself and his own messengers and ministers; for they only with prayer and effort (1 Kin. xvii. 20–22; cf. Acts ix. 40), or after a long and patient exercise of love (2 Kin. iv. 34), won back his prey from the jaws of death; the absolute *fulness* of power dwelling not in them, who were but as servants in the house of another, and not as He, a Son in his own.[4] So, too, in heathen legend, Alcestis,

'Whom Jove's great son to her glad husband gave,'[5]

---

[1] Comme pour arrêter ce fuyard de la vie, as Godet beautifully has it.

[2] See back, p. 39.

[3] Augustine (*Serm.* xcviii. 2): Nemo tam facile excitat in lecto, quam facile Christus in sepulcro.

[4] See what has been said already, p. 34. Massillon, in his sermon, *Sur la Divinité de Jesus-Christ*, has these eloquent words: Élie ressuscite des morts, il est vrai; mais il est obligé de se coucher plusieurs fois sur le corps de l'enfant qu'il ressuscite: il souffle, il se rétrécit, il s'agite: on voit bien qu'il invoque une puissance étrangère: qu'il rappelle de l'empire de la mort une âme qui n'est pas soumise à sa voix: et qu'il n'est pas lui-même le maître de la mort et de la vie. Jésus-Christ ressuscite les morts comme il fait les actions les plus communes: il parle en maître à ceux qui dorment d'un sommeil éternel; et l'on sent bien qu'il est le Dieu des morts comme des vivans, jamais plus tranquille que lorsqu'il opère les plus grandes choses.

[5] See the *Alcestis* of Euripides, 849–861.

is only rescued by force and after a terrible conflict from the power and dominion of Death.

'*And He delivered him to his mother*' (cf. 1 Kin. xvii. 23; 2 Kin. iv. 36; Luke ix. 42). Faint prelude this of that which He has in store; for not otherwise shall He once, when his great 'Arise' shall have awakened not one, but all the dead, deliver as many as have fallen asleep in Him to their beloved, for mutual recognition and for a special fellowship of joy. We have the promise and pledge of this in the three quickenings of the dead which prefigure that coming resurrection. '*And there came a fear on all*:' for all tokens of God's immediate nearness bring with them fear as their first result; and if afterwards joy, yet not this to all (cf. Mark i. 27; v. 15; Luke v. 9); '*and they glorified God*' (cf. Matt. ix. 8; Mark ii. 12), '*saying, That a great prophet is risen up among us; and, That God hath visited his people.*' This could be no ordinary prophet, they concluded rightly, since none but the very chief in the olden times, an Elijah or an Elisha, had revived the dead. They glorified God, that with the raising up of so great a prophet, *the* prophet that should come (Deut. xviii. 15; Luke i. 68, 69; John i. 21, 46; iv. 25; vi. 14; Acts iii. 22; vii. 37), He had brought the long and dreary period to a close, during which all prophecy had been silent. It was now more than four hundred years since the last of the Old Testament prophets had spoken, and the faithful in Israel may well have feared that there should now be no more open vision; that, instead of living voices and words with power from prophets in direct communication with God, there should be henceforward nothing for them but the dead words of Rabbis and doctors of the law. We may a little understand their delight, when they found that God had still his ambassadors to men, that perhaps the greatest of all these ambassadors was actually among them,[1] and the restoration of his people not far off.

[1] Philostratus (*Vita Apollonii*, iv. 45) ascribes a miracle to Apollo-

The closing words '*And this rumour of Him went forth throughout all Judæa, and throughout all the region about*' constitute the link of connexion between what the Evangelist has just narrated and what he is about to narrate. The report, he would say, of this miracle was so great that it filled not Galilee alone, where it was wrought, but all Judæa, and the region beyond, reaching even to the dungeon at Machærus where the Baptist lay a prisoner.

nius, evidently framed in imitation and rivalry of this (on this rivalry see p. 68, and Baur, *Apollonius und Christus*, p. 40). Apollonius met one day in the streets of Rome a damsel carried out to burial, followed by her betrothed and by a weeping company. He bade them set down the bier, saying he would staunch their tears; and having inquired her name, whispered something in her ear, and then taking her by the hand, he raised her up, and she began straightway to speak, and returned to her father's house. Yet Philostratus does not relate this as more, probably, than an awakening from the deep swoon of an apparent death (ἀφύπνισε τὴν κόρην τοῦ δοκοῦντος θανάτου), and suggests an explanation which reminds of the modern ones of Paulus and his school,—that Apollonius perceived in her a spark of life which had escaped the notice of physicians and attendants; but whether this, or that he did indeed kindle in her anew the extinguished spark of life, he owns it impossible for him, as it was for the bystanders, to say.

15. *THE HEALING OF THE IMPOTENT MAN AT BETHESDA.*

John v. 1–16.

THE ablest commentator in the Roman Catholic Church begins his observations on this miracle with the utterance of his hearty wish that St. John had added one word, and told us *at what 'feast of the Jews'* it was wrought;[1] he seems indeed half inclined to fall out with the Evangelist, that he has not so done. Certainly a vast amount of learned discussion would so have been spared; for this question has been much debated, and with an interest beyond that which intrinsically belongs to it; affecting, as it does, the whole chronology of St. John's Gospel, and therefore of the ministry of our Lord; seeing that, if we cannot determine the duration of that ministry from the helps which this Gospel supplies, we shall seek in vain to do it from the others. If this '*feast of the Jews*' was certainly a passover, then St. John will make mention of *four* passovers, three besides this present, namely, ii. 13; vi. 4; and the last; and we shall arrive at the three years and a half, the half of a 'week of years,' for the length of Christ's ministry, which many, not altogether unreasonably, have thought they found designated beforehand for it in the prophecies of Daniel (ix. 27). But if this be a feast of Pentecost, or, as in later times has found acceptance with many, of Purim, then the half week of years which seems by prophecy to have been measured out for

[1] Maldonatus: Magnâ nos Joannes molestiâ contentioneque liberâsset, si vel unum adjecisset verbum, quo quis ille Judæorum dies fuisset festus declarâsset.

the duration of Messiah's ministry, however likely in itself, will derive no confirmation from dates supplied by St. John; nor will it be possible to make out from him, with any certainty, a period of more than between two and three years from our Lord's baptism to the time when, by a better sacrifice, He caused 'the sacrifice and the oblation to cease.'

The oldest opinion which we have on this much-contested point is that of Irenæus. Replying to the Gnostics, who pressed the words of Isaiah, 'the acceptable *year* of the Lord,' as literally restricting our Lord's ministry to a single year, he enumerates the several passovers which He kept, and expressly includes this.[1] Origen, however, and the Alexandrian fathers, who drew from Isaiah's words the same conclusions which the Gnostics had drawn, did not, as consistently they could not, agree with Irenæus; nor did the Greek Church generally; Chrysostom, Cyril, Theophylact, understanding the feast here to have been Pentecost. At a later period, however, Theodoret, wishing to confirm his interpretation of the half week in Daniel (Dan. ix. 27), refers to St. John in proof that the Lord's ministry lasted for three years and a half,[2] and thus implies that for him this feast was a passover. Luther, Calvin, and the Reformers generally were of this mind; and were the question only between it and Pentecost, the point would have been settled long ago, as now on all sides Pentecost is given up.

But in modern times another scheme has been started,—Kepler was its first author,—which has many and weighty suffrages in its favour; to wit, that we have here a feast of Purim; that, namely, which fell just before the *second* passover in our Lord's ministry,[3] for second, and

[1] *Con. Hær.* ii. 22: Secundâ vice ascendit in diem festum Paschæ in Hierusalem, quando paralyticum qui juxta natatoriam jacebat xxxviii. annos curavit.

[2] *Comm. in Dan.*, in loc.

[3] Hug has done everything to make it plausible; and it numbers

not third, would in that case be the passover which St. John presently names (John vi. 4). I am not disposed to accept this newer distribution of the times and seasons of our Lord's life. No doubt there is something perplexing in this passover being so soon followed by another; though, if we accept the *supplementary* character of St. John's Gospel, and that it mainly records our Lord's ministry in Judæa and Jerusalem, on which the other Evangelists had dwelt so little, this perplexity will disappear; above all, when the immediate result of this miracle was an impossibility to tarry there (v. 16; vi. 1). Our Translation speaks, not of '*the feast*,' but '*a feast, of the Jews*,' and it is certainly doubtful whether the article should stand in the Greek text or no; though Tischendorf has restored it in his last edition, and it is found in the Codex Sinaiticus. If it should find a place here, and '*the feast*' be the proper rendering, this would be nearly decisive; for all other feasts so fall into the background for a Jew, as compared with the passover, that '*the feast*,' with no further addition or qualification, could hardly mean any other feast but this (John iv. 45; Matt. xxvii. 15). Still the uncertainty of the reading will not allow too great a weight to be placed on this argument. What, however, mainly prevails with me is this. The Evangelist clearly connects, though not in as many words, yet by significant juxtaposition, the Lord's going to Jerusalem with the keeping of this feast; for this He went up (cf. ii. 13). But there was nothing in the feast of Purim to draw Him thither. That was no religious feast at all; but a popular; of human, not of divine, institution. No temple service pertained to it; but men kept it at their own

Tholuck, Olshausen, Wieseler (*Chronol. Synops.* p. 205, seq.), Ellicott (*On the Life of Our Lord*, p. 135, seq.), Neander (*Leben Jesu*, p. 430), Jacobi (*Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* vol. xi. p. 861, seq.), and Lücke, though this last somewhat doubtfully, among its adherents. Hengstenberg (*Christologie*, 2nd ed. vol. iii. pp. 180–189) earnestly opposes it, and maintains the earlier view; so too does Ewald.

houses. And though naturally it would have been celebrated at Jerusalem with more pomp and circumstance than anywhere else, yet there was nothing in its feasting and its rioting, its intemperance and excess, which would have made our Lord particularly desirous to sanction it with his presence. As far as Mordecai and Esther and the deliverance wrought in their days stand below Moses, Aaron, and Miriam, and the glorious redemption from Egypt, so in true worth, in dignity, in religious significance, stood the feast of Purim below the feast of the passover; however a carnal generation may have been inclined to exaggerate the importance of that, in the past events and actual celebration of which there was so much to flatter the carnal mind. It is extremely unlikely that it was this which attracted our Lord to Jerusalem; and we shall do well to stand here upon the ancient ways, and to take this feast which our Lord adorned with his presence and signalized with this great miracle, as '*the* feast,' that which was the mother of all other feasts, the passover.

'*Now there is at Jerusalem by the sheep-market*[1] *a pool, which is called in the Hebrew tongue Bethesda,*[2] *having five porches.*' For many centuries the large excavation near the gate now called St. Stephen's, has been pointed out as

[1] Ἐπὶ τῇ *προβατικῇ* should be completed, not, as in the A. V., with *ἀγορᾷ*, but with *πύλῃ* (see Neh. iii. 1; xii. 39; LXX, *πύλη προβατικη*), and translated, 'by the sheep-*gate*,' not 'by the sheep-*market*.' Κολυμβήθρα (cf. John ix. 7) = natatoria, piscina (so Eccles. ii. 6), from *κολυμβάω*, to dive or swim, is used in ecclesiastical language alike for the building in which baptisms are performed (the baptistery), and the font containing the water (see Suicer, *Thes.* s. vv. *βαπτιστήριον* and *κολυμβήθρα*).

[2] Βηθεσδά = domus misericordiæ. Bengel and others find evidence here that this Gospel was written *before* the destruction of Jerusalem. Yet in truth this *ἔστί* proves nothing. St. John might still have said, 'There *is* at Jerusalem a pool,' that having survived the destruction; or might have written with that vivid recollection, which caused him to speak of the past as existing yet. The various reading, *ἦν* for *ἔστί*, is to be traced to transcribers, who being rightly persuaded that this Gospel was composed *after* the destruction of the city, thought that St. John must have so written.

the ancient Bethesda.[1] It is true that its immense depth, seventy-five feet, had perplexed many; yet the 'incurious ease' which has misnamed so much in the Holy Land and in Jerusalem, had remained without being seriously challenged, until Robinson, among the many traditions which he has disturbed, brought this also into question, affirming that 'there is not the slightest evidence which can identify it with the Bethesda of the New Testament.'[2] Nor does the tradition which identifies them ascend higher, as he can discover, than the thirteenth century. He sees in that excavation the remains of the ancient fosse, which protected on the north side the citadel Antonia; and the true Bethesda he thinks he finds, though on this he speaks with hesitation, in what now goes under the name of the Fountain of the Virgin, being the upper fountain of Siloam.[3]

[1] So Röhr, *Palestina*, p. 66.

[2] *Biblical Researches*, vol. i. p. 489, seq.; *Later Researches*, p. 249.

[3] He was himself witness of that remarkable phenomenon, so often mentioned of old, as by Jerome (*In Isai.* viii.): Siloe . . . qui non jugibus aquis, sed in certis horis diebusque ebulliat; et per terrarum concava et antra saxi durissimi cum magno sonitu veniat;—but which had of late fallen quite into discredit,—of the waters rapidly bubbling up, and rising with a gurgling sound in the basin of this fountain, and in a few minutes retreating again. When he was present they rose nearly or quite a foot (*Researches*, vol. i. pp. 506–508. For other modern testimonies to the same fact see Hengstenberg, *in loc.*, who has gone carefully and fully into the matter). Prudentius, whom he does not quote, has anticipated the view that this Siloam is Bethesda, and that in this phenomenon is '*the troubling of the water*,' however the healing virtue may have departed (*Apotheosis*, 680):

> Variis *Siloa* refundit
> Momentis latices, nec fluctum semper anhelat,
> Sed vice distinctâ largos lacus accipit haustus.
> Agmina languentum sitiunt spem fontis avari,
> Membrorum maculas puro abluitura natatu;
> Certatim interea roranti pumice raucas
> Expectant scatebras, et sicco margine pendent.

Perhaps it is not a slip of memory, with the confusion of this passage with John ix. 7, but his belief in the identity of Siloam and Bethesda, which makes Irenæus (*Con. Hær.* iv. 8) say of our Lord: Et Siloâ etiam sæpe sabbatis curavit; et propter hoc assidebant ei multi die sabbatorum.

'*In these lay a great multitude of impotent folk, of blind, halt, withered.*' Our Version is slightly defective here. It leaves an impression that '*impotent folk*' is the genus, presently subdivided into the three species, '*blind, halt, withered*;' whereas, instead of three being thus subordinated to one, all four are coördinated with one another. We should read rather, '*In these lay a great multitude of sick, blind, halt, withered*;' the enumeration by four, when meant to be exhaustive, being very frequent in Scripture (Ezek. xiv. 21; Rev. vi. 8; Matt. xv. 31). The words which complete this third verse, '*waiting for the moving of the water*,' lie under a certain suspicion, as verse four has certainly no right to a place in the text. That fourth verse the most important Greek and Latin copies are alike without, and most of the early Versions. In other MSS. which retain this verse, the obelus which hints suspicion, or the asterisk which marks rejection, is attached to it; while those in which it appears unquestioned belong mostly to a later recension of the text. And the undoubted spuriousness of this fourth verse has spread a certain amount of suspicion over the last clause of the verse preceding; which yet has not the same amount of diplomatic evidence against it, nay, in some sort seems almost necessary to make the story intelligible. Doubtless whatever here is addition, whether only the fourth verse, or the last clause also of the third, found very early its way into the text; we have it as early as Tertullian,—the first witness for its presence.[1] The baptismal Angel, a

[1] *De Bapt.* 5: Angelum aquis intervenire, si novum videtur, exemplum futurum præcucurrit. Piscinam Bethsaida angelus interveniens commovebat; observabant qui valetudinem querebantur. Nam si quis prævenerat descendere illuc, queri post lavacrum desinebat. Figura ista medicinæ corporalis spiritalem medicinam canebat, eâ formâ quâ semper carnalia in figurâ spiritalium antecedunt. Proficiente itaque hominibus gratiâ Dei plus aquis et angelo accessit: qui vitia corporis remediabant, nunc spiritum medentur: qui temporalem operabantur salutem, nunc æternam reformant: qui unum semel anno liberabant, nunc quotidie populos conservant. It will be observed that he calls it above,

favourite thought with him, was here foreshown and typified; as, somewhat later, Ambrose [1] saw here a prophecy of the descent of the Holy Ghost, consecrating the waters of baptism to the mystical washing away of sin; and Chrysostom makes frequent use of the verse in this sense.[2] At first probably a marginal note, expressing the popular notion of the Jewish Christians concerning the origin of the healing power which from time to time these waters possessed, by degrees it assumed the shape in which now we have it: for there are marks of growth about it, betraying themselves in a great variety of readings,—some copies omitting one part, and some another of the verse,—all which is usually the sign of a later addition: thus, little by little, it procured admission into the text, probably at Alexandria first, the birth-place of other similar additions. For the statement itself, there is nothing in it which need perplex or offend, or which might not have found place in St. John. It rests upon that religious view of the world, which in all nature sees something beyond and behind nature, which does not believe that it has discovered causes, when, in fact, it has only traced the sequence of phenomena; and which everywhere recognizes a going forth of the immediate power of God, invisible agencies of his, whether personal or otherwise, accomplishing his will.[3] That Angels should be the

the pool *Bethsaida*; this is not by accident, for it recurs (*Adv. Jud.* 13) in Augustine, and may still be found in the Vulgate and in some other ancient authorities.

[1] *De Spir. Sanct.* i. 7: Quid in hoc typo Angelus nisi descensionem Sancti Spiritûs nuntiabat, quæ nostris futura temporibus, aquas sacerdotalibus invocata precibus consecraret? and *De Myst.* 4: Illis Angelus descendebat, tibi Spiritus Sanctus; illis creatura movebatur, tibi Christus operatur ipse Dominus creaturæ.

[2] Thus *In Joh. Hom.* xxxvi.: 'As there it was not simply the nature of the waters which healed, for then they would have always done so, but when was added the energy of the Angel; so with us, it is not simply the water which works, but when it has received the grace of the Spirit, then it washes away all sins.'

[3] Theophylact mentions a curious explanation of the virtues of this

ministers of his will would be only according to the analogy of other Scripture (Heb. i. 7; Rev. vii. 2); while in 'the Angel *of the waters*' (Rev. xvi. 5) we have a remarkable point of contact with the statement of this verse; of agreement between John the Seer and, supposing these words are allowed to stand, John the Evangelist.

From among this suffering expectant multitude Christ singles out one on whom to display his power;—one only, for He came not *now* to be the healer of men's bodies, save only as He could annex to this healing the truer healing of their souls and spirits. '*And a certain man was there which had an infirmity thirty and eight years.*'[1] Some understand this poor cripple—a paralytic probably (cf. ver. 8 with Mark ii. 11; Acts ix. 33, 34)—to have actually waited at the edge of that pool for all this time. Others regard these '*thirty and eight*' as the years of his life. Neither interpretation is correct. They express the duration not of his life, but of his infirmity; but without implying that he had waited for health from that pool during all that time; though yet his waiting there, as we learn from ver. 7, had been long. '*When Jesus saw him lie, and knew that he had been now a long time in that case, He saith unto him, Wilt thou be made whole?*' A superfluous question, it might seem; for who would not '*be made whole*,' if he might? and his very presence at

pool which some in his time accepted: Εἶχον δὲ οἱ πολλοὶ ὑπόληψιν, ὅτι καὶ ἀπὸ μόνου τοῦ πλύνεσθαι τὰ ἐντόσθια τῶν ἱερείων δύναμιν τινὰ λαμβάνει θειοτέραν τὸ ὕδωρ. This explanation, much to the surprise of many, found favour with Hammond. Richter, *De Balneo Animali*, p. 107, quoted by Winer, *Realwörterbuch*, s. v. Bethesda, has adopted it: Non miror fontem tantâ adhuc virtute animali hostiarum calentem, quippe in proxima loca tempestive effusum, et pro pleniori partium miscelâ turbatum, triplici maxime infirmorum classi, quorum luculenter genus nervosum laborabat, profuisse; et quia animalis hæc virtus cito cum calore aufugit, et vappam inertem, immo putrem relinquit, iis tantum qui primi ingressi sunt, salutem attulisse.

[1] These '*thirty and eight years*,' answering so exactly to the thirty-eight years of Israel's punishment in the wilderness, have not unnaturally led many, old and new (see Hengstenberg, *Christol.* vol. ii. p. 568), to find in this man a type of Israel after the flesh.

the place of healing attested his desire. But the question has its purpose. This poor man had been so often defeated of a cure that hope was dead or wellnigh dead within him, and the question is asked to awaken in him anew a yearning after the benefit, which the Saviour, pitying his hopeless case, was about to impart. His heart may have been as '*withered*' as his limbs through his long sufferings and the long neglects of his fellow-men; it was something to learn that this stranger pitied him, was interested in his case, would help him if He could. So learning to believe in his love, he was being prepared to believe also in his might. Our Lord assisted him now to the faith, which He was about presently to demand of him.

The answer, '*Sir, I have no man, when the water is troubled, to put me into the pool*,' contains no direct reply, but an explanation why he had continued so long in his infirmity. The virtues of the water disappeared so fast, they were so pre-occupied, whether from the narrowness of the spot, or from some cause which we know not, by the first comer, that he, himself helpless, and with no man to aid, could never be this first, always therefore missed the blessing; '*while I am coming, another steppeth down before me.*' 'The poor man still was *prevented* by some other,' as Jeremy Taylor writes, showing us the word 'prevent' in its actual transition from the old meaning to the new, and explaining to us the steps of this transition. But the long and weary years of baffled expectation are now to find an end: '*Jesus saith unto him, Rise, take up thy bed, and walk.*' This taking up of his bed shall serve as a testimony to all of the completeness of the cure (cf. Matt. ix. 6; Acts ix. 34). The man believed that word to be accompanied with power; made proof, and found that it was so: '*immediately the man was made whole, and took up his bed, and walked.*' This '*bed*,' as is hardly necessary to observe, is not our modern four-poster, but a poor pallet, which, rolled up, could very easily be moved

from one spot to another. '*And on the same day was the Sabbath*'—a significant addition, explaining all which follows.

'*The Jews therefore said unto him that was cured, It is the Sabbath; it is not lawful for thee to carry thy bed.*' By '*the Jews*' we understand here, as constantly in St. John, not the multitude, but the Sanhedrists, the spiritual heads of the nation (i. 19; vii. 1; ix. 22; xviii. 12, 14; cf. ver. 3; xx. 19). These find fault with the man, for had not Moses, or rather God by the mouth of Moses, said of the Sabbath, 'In it thou shalt not do any work' (Exod. xx. 10), and still more to the point Jeremiah, 'Take heed to yourselves, and bear no burden on the Sabbath days' (xvii. 21); so that they seemed to have words of Scripture to justify their interference and the offence which they took. But the man's bearing of his bed was not a work by itself; it was merely the corollary, or indeed the concluding act, of his healing, that by which he should make proof himself, and give testimony to others, of its reality. It was lawful to heal on the Sabbath day; it was lawful then to do whatever was immediately involved in, and directly followed on, the healing. And here lay ultimately the true controversy between Christ and his adversaries, namely, whether it was most consonant to the law of God to do good on that day or to leave it undone (Luke vi. 9). Starting from the unlawfulness of leaving good undone, He asserted that He was its true keeper, keeping it as God kept it, with the highest beneficent activity, which in his Father's case, as in his own, was identical with deepest rest,—and not, as they accused Him of being, its breaker. It was because He had *Himself* 'done those things' (see ver. 16), that the Jews persecuted Him, and not for bidding the man to bear his bed, which was a mere accident involved in his own preceding act.[1] This, however, first attracted

[1] Calvin: Non suum modo factum excusat, sed ejus etiam qui grabbatum suum tulit. Erat enim appendix et quasi pars miraculi, quia nihil quam ejus approbatio erat.

their notice. Already the pharisaical Jews, starting from passages such as Exod. xxiii. 12; xxxi. 13–17; xxxv. 2, 3; Num. xv. 32–36; Nehem. xiii. 15–22, had laid down such a multitude of prohibitions, and drawn so infinite a number of hair-splitting distinctions (as we shall have occasion to see, Luke xiii. 15, 16), that a plain and unlearned man could hardly know what was forbidden and what was permitted. This poor man did not concern himself with these subtle casuistries of theirs. It was enough for him that One with power to make him whole, One who had shown compassion to him, bade him to do what he was doing: '*He answered them, He that made me whole, the same said unto me, Take up thy bed, and walk*'[1]—surely the very model of an answer, when the world finds fault and is scandalized with what a Christian is doing, contrary to its traditions, and to the rules which *it* has laid down!

After this greater offender they inquire now, as being the juster object of censure and of punishment: '*Then asked they him, What man is that which said unto thee, Take up thy bed, and walk?*' The malignity of the questioners reveals itself in the very shape which their question assumes. They do not take up the poor man's words on their more favourable side, which would also have been the more natural: nor ask, 'What man is that which made thee whole?' But, probably themselves knowing perfectly well, or at least guessing, who his Healer was, they insinuate by the form of their question that *He* could not be from God who gave a command which they, the interpreters of God's law, esteemed so grievous an outrage against it.[2] So will they weaken and undermine any influence which Christ may have obtained over this simple man—an influence already manifest in his finding the

[1] Augustine (*In Ev. Joh. tract.* xvii.): Non acciperem jussionem a quo receperam sanitatem?

[2] Grotius: En malitiæ ingenium! non dicunt, Quis est qui te sanavit? sed, Quis jussit grabatum tollere? Quærunt non quod mirentur, sed quod calumnientur.

Lord's authority sufficient to justify him in the transgression of their commandment.

But the man could not point out his benefactor; '*he that was healed wist not who it was; for Jesus had conveyed Himself away,*[1] *a multitude being in that place*'—not, as Grotius will have it, to avoid ostentation and the applauses of the people; but this mention of the multitude shall explain the facility with which He withdrew: He mingled with and passed through the crowd, and so was lost from sight in an instant. Were it not that the common people usually were on his side on occasions like the present, one might imagine that a menacing crowd under the influence of these chiefs of the Jews had gathered together, while this conversation was going forward betwixt them and the healed cripple, from whose violence the Lord, whose hour was not yet come, withdrew Himself awhile.

'*Afterward Jesus findeth him in the temple*' (cf. ix. 35). We may accept it as a token for good that Jesus found him there rather than in any other place; returning thanks, as we may well believe, for the signal mercies so lately vouchsafed to him (cf. Isai. xxxviii. 22; Acts iii. 8; Luke xvii. 15). And He, who sought ever to connect with the healing of the body the better healing of the soul, suffers not this matter to conclude thus; but by a word of solemn warning, declares to the sufferer that all his past life lay open and manifest before Him; interprets to him the past judgment, bids him not provoke future and more terrible: '*Behold, thou art made whole: sin no more, lest a*

[1] Ἐξένευσεν. This word does not occur again in the New Testament, but four times in the Septuagint (Judg. iv. 18; xviii. 26; 2 Kin. ii. 24; xxiii. 16; cf. Plutarch, *De Gen. Soc.* 4). The connexion with *νέω, νεύσομαι*, to swim, is too remote to justify Beza in urging this image here, as he does: Proprie dicitur de iis qui ex undis enatant, fortassis quod qui clam nititur ex turbâ elabi, corpus non aliter summittat, quam qui ex undis emergat. It is simply, glided out, evasit (not evaserat, not '*had* conveyed himself away'), declinavit (Vulg.), with a connotation originally in the word of that sideward movement which one who desires to make his way rapidly through a crowd, and therefore to present the least possible front, will often employ.

worse thing come unto thee'—words which give us an awful glimpse of the severity of God's judgments even in this present time; for we must not restrict, as some have done, this '*worse thing*' to judgment beyond the grave:—'*a worse thing*' even in this life might befall him than those eight and thirty years of infirmity and pain. His sickness had found him a youth, and left him an old man; it had withered up all his manhood, and yet '*a worse thing*' even than this is threatened him, should he sin again.[1] Let no man, however miserable, count that he has exhausted the power of God's wrath. The arrows that have pierced him may have been keen; but there are keener yet, if only he provoke them, in the quiver from whence these were drawn.

What the past sin of this sufferer had been we do not know, but the sufferer himself knew very well; his conscience interpreted the warning. This much, however, is plain to us; that Christ connected the man's suffering with his own particular sin; for, however He rebuked elsewhere men's uncharitable way of tracing such a connexion, and that unrighteous *Theodicee*, which should in every case affirm a man's personal suffering to be in proportion to his personal guilt (Luke xiii. 2, 3; John ix. 3); yet He never meant thereby to deny that if much of judgment is deferred, much also is even now proceeding. However unwilling we may be to receive this, bringing as it does God so near, and making retribution so real and so prompt a thing, yet is it true notwithstanding. As some eagle, pierced with a shaft feathered from its own wing, so many a sufferer, even in this present time, sees and is compelled to acknowledge that his own sin fledged

[1] Calvin: Si nihil ferulis proficiat erga nos Deus, quibus leniter nos tanquam teneros ac delicatos filios humanissimus pater castigat, novam personam et quasi alienam induere cogitur. Flagella ergo ad domandum nostram ferociam accipit. Quare non mirum est si atrocioribus pœnis quasi malleis conterat Deus, quibus mediocris pœna nihil prodest: frangi enim æquum est, qui corrigi non sustinent.

the arrow, which has pierced him and brought him down. And lest he should miss the connexion, oftentimes he is punished, it may be is himself sinned against by his fellow-man, in the very kind wherein he himself has sinned against others (Judg. i. 6, 7; Gen. xlii. 21; Wisd. xi. 16; Ezek. xxxv. 6, 15; Jer. li. 49; Hab. ii. 8; Rev. xvi. 6). The deceiver is deceived, as was Jacob (Gen. xxvii. 19, 24; xxix. 23; xxxi. 7; xxxvii. 32); the violator of the sanctities of family life is himself wounded and outraged in his tenderest and dearest relations, as was David (2 Sam. xi. 4; xiii. 14; xvi. 22); the troubler is troubled (Josh. vii. 25); those who 'destroy' the earth shall themselves be 'destroyed' (Rev. xi. 18). He has no choice but to say like the dying Edmund in *King Lear*, 'The wheel has come full circle, I am here.' And many a sinner, who cannot thus read his own doom, for it is a final and a fatal one, yet declares in that doom to others that there is in very deed a coming back upon men of their sins. The grandson of Ahab is himself treacherously slain in the portion of Naboth the Jezreelite (2 Kin. ix. 23); William Rufus perishes, himself the third of his family who does so, in the New Forest, a chief scene of the sacrilege and the crimes of his race.[1]

'*The man departed, and told the Jews that it was Jesus, which had made him whole.*' Whom he did not recognize in the crowd, he has recognized in the temple. This is Augustine's remark, who hereupon finds occasion to commend that inner calm and solitude of spirit in which alone we shall recognize the Lord.[2] Yet while such remarks

[1] Tragedy in its highest form continually occupies itself with this truth—nowhere, perhaps, so grandly as in the awful *reproduction* in the *Choëphoræ* of the scene in the *Agamemnon* in which Clytæmnestra stood over the prostrate bodies of Agamemnon and Cassandra—a reproduction *with only the difference* that now it is she and her paramour who are the slain, and her own son who stands over *her*. So on all this subject, namely, the rule in God's moral world of retaliation or 'counter-passion,' as he calls it, see Jackson, *On the Divine Essence and Attributes*, book vi. sect. 4, ch. 31–38.

[2] *In Ev. Joh. tract.* xvii.: Difficile est in turbâ videre Christum.

have their own worth, they are scarcely applicable here. The man probably learned from the bystanders the name of his deliverer, and went and told it,—assuredly not, as some assume, in treachery, or to augment the envy already existing against Him,—but gratefully proclaiming aloud and to the rulers of his nation the physician who had healed him.[1] He may have counted, in the simplicity of his heart, that the name of Him, whose reputation, though not his person, he had already known, whom so many counted as a prophet, or even as the Messiah Himself, would be sufficient to stop the mouths of the gainsayers. Had he wrought in a baser spirit, he would not, as Chrysostom ingeniously observes, have gone and told them '*that it was Jesus, which had made him whole*,' but rather that it was Jesus, who had bidden him to carry his bed. Moreover, we may be quite sure that the Lord, who knew what was in man, would not have wasted his benefits on so mean and thankless a wretch as this man would have thus shown himself to be.

His word did not allay their displeasure, only provoked it the more. '*And therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus, and sought to slay Him, because He had done these things on the Sabbath day.*' Christ had in their eyes wilfully violated the Sabbath, and the penalty of this wilful violation was death (Num. xv. 32–36). But there was no such violation here; and He, returning good for evil, will fain raise them to the true point of view from which to contemplate the Sabbath, and his own relation to it as the Only-begotten of the Father. He is no more a breaker of the Sabbath than his Father is, when He upholds with an energy that knows no pause the work of his creation from

Turba strepitum habet; visio ista secretum desiderat. In turbâ non eum vidit, in templo vidit.

[1] Calvin: Nihil minus in animo habuit quam conflare Christo invidiam; nihil enim minus speravit quam ut tantopere furerent adversus Christum. Pius ergo affectus fuit, quum vellet justo ac debito honore medicum suum prosequi.

hour to hour and from moment to moment: '*My Father worketh hitherto, and I work*;' Christ's work is but the reflex of his Father's work. Abstinence from an outward work is not essential to the observance of a Sabbath; it is only more or less the necessary condition of this for beings so framed and constituted as ever to be in danger of losing the true collection and rest of the spirit in the multiplicity of earthly toil and business. Man indeed must cease from *his* work, if a higher work is to find place in him. He scatters himself in his work, and therefore must collect himself anew, and have seasons for so doing. But with Him who is one with the Father it is otherwise. In Him the deepest rest is not excluded by the highest activity; nay rather, in God, in the Son as in the Father, they are one and the same.[1]

But so to defend what He has done only exasperates his adversaries the more. They have here not a Sabbath-breaker merely, but a blasphemer as well; for, however others in later times may have interpreted his words, they who first heard them interpreted them correctly;[2] that the Lord was here claiming divine attributes for Himself: '*Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill Him, because He had not only broken the Sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, making Himself equal with God*' (Lev. xxiv. 16; John viii. 58, 59; x. 31; xix. 7). Strange, if the Unitarians are right, that He should have suffered them to continue in their terrible mistake, that He should not at once have taken this stumbling-

[1] Thus Augustine on the eternal Sabbath-keeping of the faithful (*Ep.* lv. 9): Inest autem in illâ requie non desidiosa segnitia, sed quædam ineffabilis tranquillitas actionis otiosæ. Sic enim ab hujus vitæ operibus in fine requiescitur, ut in alterius vitæ actione gaudeatur. Cf. Philo, *Leg. Alleg.* i. § 3, a grand passage, commencing thus: Παύεται γὰρ οὐδέποτε ποιῶν ὁ Θεὸς, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἴδιον τὸ καίειν πυρὸς, καὶ χιόνος τὸ ψυχεῖν, οὕτω καὶ Θεοῦ τὸ ποιεῖν· καὶ πολύ γε μᾶλλον, ὅσῳ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἅπασιν ἀρχὴ τοῦ δρᾶν ἐστιν.

[2] Augustine (*In Ev. Joh. tract.* xvii.): Ecce intelligunt Judæi, quod non intelligunt Ariani.

block out of their way, and explained to them that they mistook his words, that indeed He meant nothing so dreadful as they supposed! but so far from this, He only reasserts what has already offended them so deeply, and this in words than which none in Holy Scripture have contributed more to the fast fixing of the doctrine concerning the relations of the Father and the Son. Other passages may contain as important witness against the Arian, other against the Sabellian, departure from the truth; but this upon both sides plants the pillars of the faith. It would lead, however, too far from the purpose of this volume to enter on it here.

I conclude with a brief reference to a matter in part anticipated already, namely, the types and prophetic symbols which have been often traced in this history. Many, as has been already noticed, found in these healing influences of the pool of Bethesda a foreshowing of future benefits, above all, of the benefit of baptism; and, through familiarity with a miracle of a lower order, a helping of men's faith to a receiving of the mystery of a yet higher healing which should be linked with water.[1] They were well pleased also to magnify the largeness and freedom of the later grace, by comparing it with the narrower and more stinted blessings of the former dispensation.[2] The pool with its one healed, and that one at distant intervals, —once a year Theophylact and most others assumed, although nothing of the kind is said, and the word of the original may mean oftener or seldomer,—was the type of the weaker and more restrained graces of the Old Covenant; when not as yet was there room for all, nor

[1] So especially Chrysostom (in loc.).

[2] Tertullian (*Adv. Jud.* 13) adduces as one of the signs that even these scanty blessings did with the Jewish rejection of Christ cease altogether, that from that day forth, this pool forfeited its healing powers: Lex et Prophetæ usque ad Joannem fuerunt; et piscina Bethsaïda usque ad adventum Christi, curando invaletudines ab Israel, desiit a beneficiis deinde cum ex perseverantiâ furoris sui nomen Domini per ipsos blasphemaretur.

a fountain opened, and at all times accessible, for the healing of the spiritual sicknesses of eht whole race of men, but only of a single people.[1]

Thus Chrysostom, in a magnificent Easter sermon[2] (it will be remembered that at that season multitudes of neophytes were baptized): 'Among the Jews also there was of old a pool of water. Yet learn whereunto it availed, that thou mayest accurately measure the Jewish poverty and our riches. There went down, it is said, an Angel and moved the waters, and who first descended into them after this moving, obtained a cure. The Lord of Angels went down into the stream of Jordan, and sanctifying the nature of water, healed the whole world. So that there, indeed, he who descended after the first was not healed; for to the Jews, infirm and carnal, this grace was not given: but here after the first a second descends, after the second a third and a fourth; and were it a thousand, didst thou cast the whole world into these spiritual fountains, the grace would not be worn out, the gift expended, the fountains defiled, the liberality exhausted.' And Augustine, ever watching to bring out his great truth that the Law was for the revealing of sin, and could not effect its removal, for the making men to know their sickness, not for the healing of that sickness, to drag them out of the lurking-places of an imaginary righteousness, not to provide them of itself with any surer refuge, finds a type, or at least an apt illustration of this, in those '*five porches*,' which *showed* their sick, but could not *cure* them; in which they '*lay, a great multitude of impotent folk, blind, halt, withered.*' It needed that the waters should be stirred, before any power went forth for their cure. This motion of the pool was the agitation of the Jewish people at the

[1] The author of the work attributed to Ambrose (*De Sacram.* ii. 2): Tunc inquam temporis in figurâ qui prior descendisset, solus curabatur. Quanto major est gratia Ecclesiæ, in quâ omnes salvantur, quicunque descendunt!

[2] *Opp.* vol. iii. p. 756, Bened. ed.

coming of the Lord Jesus Christ. Then powers were stirring for their healing; and he who '*went down*,' he who humbly believed in his Incarnation, in his descent as a man amongst us, who was not offended at his lowly estate, was healed of whatsoever disease he had.[1]

[1] *Enarr.* i. *in Ps.* lxx. 15: Merito lex per Moÿsen data est, gratia et veritas per Jesum Christum facta est. Moÿses quinque libros scripsit; sed in quinque porticibus piscinam cingentibus languidi jacebant, sed curari non poterant. . . . Illis enim quinque porticibus, in figurâ quinque librorum, prodebantur potius quam sanabantur ægroti. . . . Venit Dominus, turbata est aqua, et crucifixus est, descendat ut sanetur ægrotus. Quid est, descendat? Humiliet se. Ergo quicumque amatis litteram sine gratiâ, in porticibus remanebitis, ægri eritis; jacentes, non convalescentes: de litterâ enim præsumitis. Cf. *Enarr. in Ps.* lxxxiii. 7: Qui non sanabatur Lege, id est porticibus, sanatur gratiâ, per passionis fidem Domini nostri Jesu Christi. *Serm.* cxxv.: Ad hoc data est lex, quæ proderet ægrotos, non quæ tolleret. Ideo ergo ægroti illi qui in domibus suis secretius ægrotare possent, si illæ quinque porticus non essent, prodebantur oculis omnium in illis porticibus, sed a porticibus non sanabantur. . . . Intendite ergo. Erant illæ porticus legem significantes, portantes ægrotos non sanantes, prodentes non curantes. Cf. *In Ev. Joh. tract.* xvii.

16. *THE MIRACULOUS FEEDING OF FIVE THOUSAND.*

MATT. xiv. 15–21; MARK vi. 34–44; LUKE ix. 12–17; JOHN vi. 5–14.

THIS miracle, with that of the walking on the sea, which may be regarded as an appendix to it, is the only one which St. John has in common with the other Evangelists; but this he shares with them all. It is thus the only one of which a fourfold record exists. In what I write on the matter it will be my endeavour to keep all the narratives in view, as they mutually complete one another. St. Matthew connects the Lord's retirement to the desert place on the other side of the lake,[1] with the murder of John the Baptist;[2] St. Mark and St. Luke place the two events in juxtaposition, but without making one the motive of the other. St. Mark, indeed, gives another as the immediate motive, namely, that the Apostles, who were

[1] Dean Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, p. 371: 'The eastern shores of the lake have been so slightly visited and described, that any comparison of their features with the history must necessarily be precarious. Yet one general characteristic of that shore, as compared with the western side, has been indicated, which was probably the case in ancient times, though in a less degree than at present, namely, its desert character. Partly this arises from its nearer exposure to the Bedouin tribes; partly from its less abundance of springs and streams. There is no recess in the eastern hills, no towns along its banks corresponding to those in the Plain of Gennesareth. Thus the wilder region became a natural refuge from the active life of the western shores. It was "when He saw great multitudes about Him" that "He gave commandment to depart unto the *other side*;" and again He said, "Come ye yourselves apart into a desert place, and rest awhile; for there were many coming and going, and they had no leisure so much as to eat."'

[2] Ludolphus: Ut parceret inimicis ne homicidium Domini jungerent homicidio Johannis.

just returned from their mission, might have time at once for bodily and spiritual refreshment, might not be always in a crowd, always ministering to others, never to themselves. But thither, '*into a desert place belonging to the city called Bethsaida*,'[1] the multitude followed Him; not necessarily '*afoot*,' for πεζῇ (Mark vi. 33) need not, and here does not, imply this;[2] but '*by land*,' as distinguished from Him and his company, who made the passage *by sea*. They lost so little time on their journey, that although their way was much longer about than his, who had only to cross the lake, they '*outwent*' Him, anticipated his coming, so that when He '*went forth*,' not, that is, from the ship, but from his solitude, and for the purpose of graciously receiving those who followed Him with such devotion,[3] He '*saw much people*' waiting for Him. This presence of theirs entirely defeated the intention with which He had sought that solitude; yet not the less He '*received them, and spake unto them of the kingdom of God, and healed them that had need of healing*.' St. John's apparently casual notice of the fact that '*the passover, a feast of the Jews, was nigh*,' is introduced, some say, to explain from whence this great multitude came; that they were on their road to Jerusalem, there to keep the feast. But what should they have done in that remote region, so far withdrawn from

[1] Dean Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, p. 374: 'Bethsaida is the eastern city of that name, which, from the importance of the new city Julias, built there by Philip the Tetrarch [see Josephus, *B. J.* iii. 9. 1; *Antiq.* xviii. 2. 1; and cf. Pliny, *H. N.* v. 15], would give its name to the surrounding desert tract. The "*desert place*" was either one of the green tablelands visible from the hills on the western side, or more probably part of the rich plain at the mouth of the Jordan. In the parts of this plain not cultivated by the hand of man would be found the "*much green grass*," still fresh in the spring of the year when this event occurred, before it had faded away in the summer sun,—the tall grass, which, broken down by the feet of the thousands there gathered together, would make as it were "couches" (κλισίας) for them to recline upon.' This Bethsaida must be carefully distinguished from 'Bethsaida *of Galilee*,' the city of Peter, Andrew, and Philip (Matt. xi. 21; John i. 44; xii. 21).

[2] Herodotus, vii. 110; Plato, *Menex.* 236 e.

[3] Ludolphus: Minores sequebantur, sed majores persequebantur.

all the usual lines of communication? St. John accounts in another way for their presence. They were there, 'because they saw his miracles which He did on them that were diseased.' The mention of the passover here, if it is to find an explanation, and is anything more than the fixing of a point in the chronology of our Lord's ministry, must be otherwise explained.[1]

The way is prepared for the miracle somewhat differently by the three earlier Evangelists, and by St. John. According to them, '*when it was evening his disciples came to Him, saying, This is a desert place, and the time is now past; send the multitude away, that they may go into the villages, and buy themselves victuals.*' The first suggestion comes here from the disciples; while in St. John it is the Lord Himself who, in his question to Philip, '*Whence shall we buy bread, that these may eat?*' (vi. 5) first contemplates the difficulty. This difference, however, is capable of an easy explanation. Our Lord may have put this question to Philip at a somewhat earlier period of the afternoon; then left the difficulty which He had suggested to work in the minds of the Apostles; bringing them, as was so often his manner, to see that there was no help in the common course of things; and when they had acknowledged this, then, and not before, stepping in with his higher aid.[2]

[1] Godet has suggested a very beautiful explanation of the mention here of the passover: La mention de la grande fête qui approchait est donc en relation, non avec l'arrivée des troupes, mais avec l'acte de Jésus. Jésus est dans la position d'un proscrit. Il ne peut aller célébrer la Pâque à Jérusalem. En voyant accourir à lui au désert cette multitude affamée du pain de vie, il est profondément ému: il reconnaît dans cette circonstance inattendue un signal qui lui est donné par le Père. Il pense aux foules qui dans ce moment même se pressent à Jérusalem pour y manger l'agneau pascal, et il se dit: 'Et moi aussi je célébrerai une Pâque!' Cette pensée est celle qui met toute la scène suivante et le discours qui s'y rattache dans leur véritable jour. Par le vers. 4 Jean nous donne la clef du récit.

[2] For the reconciliation of any apparent contradiction, see Augustine, *De Cons. Evang.* ii. 46.

St. John, ever careful to avert a misconception of his Lord's words (ii. 21; xxi. 22), above all, one which might seem to derogate from his perfect wisdom or love, does not fail to inform us that He asked this question, not as needing any counsel, not as being Himself in any real embarrassment, '*for He Himself knew what He would do*,' but '*tempting him*,' as Wiclif's translation has it, or '*to prove him*,' as has our own; which here rightly gives to the word of the original its mildest sense[1] (cf. Gen. xxii. 1). It was '*to prove him*,' and what measure of faith he had in that Master whom he had himself already acknowledged as 'Him of whom Moses in the Law and the prophets did write' (John i. 45). It should now be seen whether Philip, calling to mind the great things which Moses had done, giving to the people bread from heaven in the wilderness, and the notable miracle which Elisha, though on a smaller scale, had performed (2 Kin. iv. 43, 44), could so lift up his thoughts as to believe that He whom he had recognized as the Christ, greater therefore than Moses or the prophets, would meet the present need. Why Philip was singled out for proof it is impossible to say; but whatever the motive may have been, he does not abide it. Long as he has been with Jesus, he has not yet seen, he had not seen at a later day, the Father in the Son (John xiv. 9); he does not understand that the Lord whom he serves upon earth is even the same on whom all creatures wait, who 'openeth his hand, and filleth all things living with plenteousness,' who has sustained them from the creation of the world, and who therefore can feed these few thousands that are this day more particularly dependent on his bounty. He can conceive of no other supplies save such as natural

[1] Πειράζων αὐτόν. Cf. Augustine (*De Serm. Dom. in Mon.* ii. 9): Illud factum est, ut ipse sibi notus fieret qui tentabatur, suamque desperationem condemnaret, saturatis turbis de pane Domini, qui eas non habere quod ederent existimaverat. See my *Synonyms of the N. T.* § 74.

means could procure, and at once comes to the point: '*Two hundred pennyworth of bread is not sufficient for them, that every one of them may take a little.*' The sum he names, about some seven pounds sterling, was much larger—for so much he would imply—than any which the common purse could yield.

Having drawn from the mouth of Philip this confession of inability to meet the present need, He left it to work; —till, somewhat later in the day, the disciples came with their proposal that He should dismiss the assemblage. But bringing now the matter to a head, He replies, '*They need not depart; give ye them to eat.*' They repeat with one mouth what Philip had before affirmed, how far, namely, the outlay exceeded their means, '*Shall we go and buy two hundred pennyworth of bread, and give them to eat?*' We may compare the remonstrance which on a somewhat similar occasion Moses had made: 'Shall the flocks and the herds be slain for them, to suffice them?' (Num. xi. 22; cf. Ps. lxxviii. 19, 20); there is the same mitigated infidelity in both; the same doubt whether the power of the Lord is equal to that which his word, expressly or implicitly, has undertaken. But not heeding this He proceeds, '*How many loaves have ye? go and see.*' They return and tell Him that the utmost which they have at command is five loaves and two fishes,[1] the little stock which a single lad among the multitude has to sell; and which they have purchased, or may purchase if they will.[2]

With this slender stock of homeliest fare, for St. John

[1] Instead of ἰχθύες, St. John has ὀψάρια, both here and xxi. 9. The diminutive of ὄψον (from ἕψω, to prepare by fire), it properly means any προσφάγιον or pulmentum, anything, as flesh, salt, olives, butter, &c., which should be eaten as a relish with bread. But by degrees, as Plutarch (*Symp.* iv. 4) remarks, ὄψον and ὀψάριον came to be restricted with a narrower use to fish alone, generally salt fish, the most usual condiment of bread (see Suicer, *Thes.* s. v. ὀψάριον; the *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Antt.* s. v. *Opsonium*; and Becker, *Charicles*, vol. i. p. 436).

[2] Grotius: Apud alios Evangelistas dicuntur habere id quod in promptu erat, ut emi posset.

informs us that the loaves were of barley (cf. 2 Kin. vii. 1; Jud. vii. 13; Ezek. iv. 12),[1] the Lord undertakes to satisfy all that multitude (Chrysostom quotes aptly here Ps. lxxviii. 19: 'Shall God prepare a table in the wilderness?'); for '*He commanded them to make all sit down by companies on the green grass*,' at that early spring season a delightful resting-place.[2] '*So the men*[3] *sat down, in number about five thousand.*' The mention of this '*green grass*,' or '*much grass*,' is another point of contact between St. Mark and St. John. The former adds a further graphic touch, how they sat in companies, '*by hundreds and by fifties*,' and how these separate groups showed in their symmetrical arrangement like so many garden-plots.[4] It was a prudent precaution. The vast assemblage was thus subdivided and broken up into manageable portions; there was less danger of tumult and confusion, or that the weaker, the women and the children, should be passed over, while the stronger and ruder unduly put themselves forward; the Apostles were able to pass easily up and down among

[1] Vile hordeum, as Phædrus (ii. 7) has it; compare Pliny, *H. N.* xviii. 7.

[2] . . . . prostrati gramine molli,
Præsertim cum tempestas arridet, et anni
Tempora conspergunt viridantes floribus herbas.

[3] Ἄνδρες (John vi. 10), not ἄνθρωποι, as in the first clause of the verse; which puts this in exact agreement with Matt. xiv. 21: see Professor Blunt, *Duties of a Parish Priest*, p. 62. Godet: Conformément aux usages de l'Orient, d'après lesquels les femmes et les enfants doivent se tenir à l'écart, les hommes seuls (οἱ ἄνδρες, Jean vi. 10) paraissent s'être assis dans l'ordre indiqué. Cela explique pourquoi, d'après les synoptiques, ils furent *seuls* comptés, comme le disent Luc (vers. 14), Marc (vers. 44), et plus expressément encore Matthieu (vers. 21), 'sans les femmes et les enfans.'

[4] Πρασιαὶ πρασιαί – areolatim, as in garden-plots or parterres. Theophylact: Πρασιαὶ γὰρ λέγονται τὰ ἐν τοῖς κήποις διάφορα κόμματα, ἐν οἷς φυτεύονται διάφορα πολλάκις λάχανα. Some derive it from πέρας, these patches being commonly on the edges of the vineyard or garden; others from πράσον, porrum, the onion being largely grown in them. Our English '*in ranks*' does not reproduce the picture to the eye, giving rather the notion of continuous lines; Wiclif's '*by parties*' was better. Perhaps '*in groups*' would be as near as we could get to it in English.

the groups, and to minister in orderly succession to them all.

The taking of the bread in hand was a formal act which went before the blessing or giving of thanks for it [1] (Luke xxiv. 30; 1 Cor. xi. 23). This eucharistic act Jesus accomplished as the head of the household, and according to that beautiful saying of the Talmud, 'He that enjoys aught without thanksgiving, is as though he robbed God.' Having blessed, He '*brake and gave the loaves to his disciples, and the disciples to the multitude*;'—the marvellous multiplication taking place, as some affirm, first in the Saviour's own hands, next in the hands of the Apostles, and lastly in those of the eaters. This may have been so; but whether thus or in some other way, '*they did all eat, and were filled*' [2] (Ps. cxlv. 16). Christ was herein fulfilling for this multitude his own promise, 'Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you' (Matt. vi. 33). They had come taking no thought, for the time at least, of what they should eat or what they should drink, only desirous to hear the word of life, only seeking the kingdom of heaven; and now the lower things, according to the word of the promise, were added unto them.

This miracle, even more than that of the water

[1] In St. Matthew and St. Mark, *εὐλόγησε*,—in St. Luke, *εὐλόγησεν αὐτούς*, sc. *τοὺς ἄρτους*,—in St. John, *καὶ εὐχαριστήσας*, which word on occasion of the second multiplying of the bread both St. Matthew (xv. 36) and St. Mark (viii. 6) use, though the latter has in the verse following *εὐλογήσας* in respect of the fishes. The terms are synonymous: cf. Matt. xxvi. 27, with the parallels, 1 Cor. x. 16; xi. 24; and see Grotius on Matt. xxvi. 26. Origen's view that our Lord wrought the wonder *τῷ λόγῳ καὶ τῇ εὐλογίᾳ*, that this moment of taking the loaves into his hand and blessing was the wonder-crisis, is sustained by the fact that all four Evangelists bring out the circumstance of the blessing, and most of all by St. Luke's words, *εὐλόγησεν αὐτούς*: cf. John vi. 23.

[2] *Χορτάζεσθαι*, properly, to *fodder* cattle, was transferred by writers of the later Comedy to the *feeding* of men; see examples in Athenæus (*Deipnos.* iii. 56), where one justifies himself for using *χορτασθῆναι* as = *κορεσθῆναι* (cf. Sturz, *De Dial. Maced.* pp. 200–202).

changed into wine, when we endeavour to realize to ourselves *the manner* of it, evermore eludes our grasp, and baffles imagination. Nor is this strange; for indeed, how can it be possible to bring within forms of our conception, or in thought to bridge over the gulf between not-being and being, which yet is bridged over in every creative act? And this being so, there is no force in the objection which one has made against the historical truth of this narrative, namely, that 'there is no attempt by closer description to make clear in its details the manner and process by which this wonderful bread was formed.' It is true wisdom, to leave the indescribable undescribed, and without so much as an attempt at the description.[1] They who bear record of these things appeal to the same faith, on the part of their readers or hearers, as that which believes 'that the worlds were framed *by the Word of God*, so that things which are seen, were not made of things which do appear' (Heb. xi. 3).

An analogy, and, so to speak, a help to the understanding of this miracle has been found, in that which year by year is accomplished in the field, where a single grain of corn multiplies itself, and in the end unfolds in numerous ears;—and, with this analogy in view, many beautiful remarks have been made; as this, that while God's every-day miracles had grown cheap in men's sight by continual repetition, He had therefore reserved something, not more wonderful, but less frequent, to arouse men's minds to a new admiration. Others have urged that here, as in the case of the water made wine, Christ did but compress into a single moment all those processes which in ordinary circumstances He, the same Lord of nature, causes more slowly

[1] Thus Hilary (*De Trin.* iii. § 6): Fallunt momenta visum, dum plenam fragmentis manum sequeris, alteram sine damno portionis suæ contueris. . . . Non sensus non visus profectum tam inconspicabilis operationis assequitur. Est, quod non erat; videtur quod non intelligitur; solum superest ut Deus omnia posse credatur. Cf. Ambrose, *Exp. in Luc.* vi. 85.

to succeed one another.[1] But, true as in its measure is this, the analogy is good only to a certain point. For that which finds place in the field is the unfolding of the seed according to the law of its own being. Thus, if the Lord had taken a few grains of corn and cast them into the ground, and if, a moment after, a large harvest had sprung up, to this the name of such a 'divinely-hastened nature-process' might have been fitly applied.[2] But with bread it is otherwise; since, before that is made, there must be new interpositions of man's art, and those of such a character that by them the very life, which up to this point has unfolded itself, must be crushed and destroyed. A grain of wheat left to itself could never, according to the laws of natural evolution, issue in a loaf of bread. And, moreover, the

[1] Augustine (*Serm.* cxxx. 1): Grande miraculum: sed non multum mirabimur factum, si adtendamus facientem. Ille multiplicavit in manibus frangentium quinque panes, qui in terrâ germinantia multiplicat semina, ut grana pauca mittantur, et horrea repleantur. Sed quia illud omni anno facit, nemo miratur. Admirationem tollit non facti vilitas sed assiduitas. And again (*In Ev. Joh. tract.* xxiv.): Quia enim . . . miracula ejus, quibus totum mundum regit, universamque creaturam administrat, assiduitate viluerunt, ita ut pene nemo dignetur adtendere opera Dei mira et stupenda in quolibet seminis grano; secundum ipsam suam misericordiam servavit sibi quædam quæ faceret opportuno tempore præter usitatum cursum ordinemque naturæ, ut non majora sed insolita videndo stuperent, quibus quotidiana viluerant. . . . Illud mirantur homines, non quia majus est, sed quia rarum est. Quis enim et nunc pascit universum mundum, nisi ille qui de paucis granis segetes creat? Fecit ergo quomodo Deus. Unde enim multiplicat de paucis granis segetes, inde in manibus suis multiplicavit quinque panes. Potestas enim erat in manibus Christi. Panes autem illi quinque quasi semina erant, non quidem terræ mandata, sed ab eo qui terram fecit, multiplicata. And again, *Serm.* cxxvi. 3: Quotidiana miracula Dei non facilitate sed assiduitate viluerant. . . . Mirati sunt homines, Dominum Deum nostrum Jesum Christum de quinque panibus saginâsse tot millia, et non mirantur per pauca grana impleri segetibus terras. . . . Quia tibi ista viluerant, venit ipse ad facienda insolita, ut et in ipsis solitis agnosceres Artificem tuum. Cf. *Serm.* ccxlvii.

[2] In the *Evangelium S. Thomæ* such a miracle is ascribed to the child Jesus; the wonder, however, not consisting in the swiftness, but the largeness, of the return. He goes out at sowing time with Joseph into the field, and sows there a single grain of wheat; from this He has the return of a hundred *cors*, which He distributes to the poor (Thilo, *Cod. Apocryphus*, p. 302).

Lord does not start here from the simple germ, from the lifeful rudiments, wherein all the seeds of a future life might be assumed to be wrapt up, and by Him rapidly developed, but with the latest artificial product. The oak is folded up in the acorn, but not in a piece of timber hewn and shaped from itself. This analogy then, even as such, presently fails; and renouncing all helps to faith to be gotten from this quarter,[1] we must be content to behold in this multiplying of the bread an act of divine omnipotence,[2]—not indeed now, as at the first, of absolute creation out of nothing, since there was a substratum to work on in the original loaves and fishes, but an act of creative accretion; a *quantitative*, as in the water turned into wine there was a *qualitative*, miracle, the bread *growing* in the Lord's hands, so that from that little stock the whole multitude were abundantly supplied. Thus He, all whose works were 'signs,' embodied and visible words, did in this miracle proclaim Himself the true bread of the world, the unexhausted and inexhaustible upholder of all life, in whom there should be enough and to spare for the spiritual needs

[1] The tracing in the natural world of analogies, nearer or more remote, for the miracles may spring from two, and those very opposite, motives. Some will endeavour hereby to realize to themselves the course of the miracle, and by the help of workings not wholly dissimilar, to bring it vividly before the eye of their mind,—delighted in thus finding traces of one and the same God in the lower world and the higher, and in marking how the natural and supernatural are concentric circles, though one wider than and embracing the other; as when in animal magnetism analogies have been found to the healing power which streamed forth from Christ, and this by some who have kept this obscure and perilous power of our lower nature altogether distinct from that pure element of light and life, which went forth and was diffused from Him. But these analogies may be sought out and welcomed in a very different spirit, with the view, by their aid, of escaping from the miraculous in the miracle altogether; as when some have snatched at these same facts of animal magnetism, not as lower and remote analogies, but as identical, or well-nigh identical, facts with the miraculous healings of our Lord.

[2] Augustine (*In Ev. Joh. tract.* ix.): Omnipotentia Domini quasi fons panis erat; and again (*Enarr.* ii. *in Ps.* cx. 10): Fontes panis erant in manibus Domini.

of all hungering souls in all ages.[1] For, in Augustine's language, once already quoted, 'He was the Word of God; and all the acts of the Word are themselves words for us; they are not as pictures, merely to look at and admire, but as letters, which we must seek to read and understand.'[2]

When all had eaten and were satisfied, the disciples '*took up of the fragments that remained twelve baskets full*,' —for every Apostle a basket; St. Mark alone records that it was so done with the fishes also; the existence of these fragments witnessing that there had been enough for all, and to spare (2 Kin. iv. 43, 44; Ruth ii. 14). Only St. John mentions that they do this at their Lord's bidding, and only he the motive, '*that nothing be lost*.'[3] For thus with the Lord of nature as with nature herself, the most prodigal bounty goes hand in hand with the nicest and exactest economy; and He who had but now shown Himself God, again submits Himself to the laws and conditions of his life upon earth, so that, as in the miracle itself his power, in this command his humility, shines eminently forth. '*The fragments*,' or perhaps 'broken pieces' would be better, which remained over must have immensely exceeded in bulk the original stock; and we have thus a visible symbol of that love which exhausts not itself by loving, but after the most prodigal outgoings upon others, abides itself far richer than it would else have done; of the multiplying which there

[1] Thus Prudentius:

> Tu cibus panisque noster, tu perennis suavitas;
> Nescit esurire in ævum qui tuam sumit dapem,
> Nec lacunam ventris implet, sed fovet vitalia.

[2] Verbum Dei est Christus, qui non solum sonis sed etiam factis loquitur hominibus; cf. *In Ev. Joh. tract.* xxiv.: Interrogemus ipsa miracula quid nobis loquantur de Christo; habent enim, si intelligantur, linguam suam.

[3] Guilliaul adds another reason for this command: Ne quis phantasma, præstigium, aut imaginationem esse causaretur, dixit discipulis, Colligite reliquias convivii, ne quid pereat.

ever is in a true dispensing; of the increasing which may go along with a scattering (Prov. xi. 24; cf. 2 Kin. iv. 1–7).

St. John,—always careful to note whatever actively stirred up the malignity of Christ's enemies, and thus hastened the final catastrophe,—which nothing did more to bring about than the utterances of the people's favour, —alone tells us of the impression which this miracle left upon the multitude; how '*those men, when they had seen the miracle that Jesus did, said, This is of a truth that prophet that should come into the world*' (cf. vii. 40), the prophet of whom Moses spake, like to himself, whom God would raise up (Deut. xviii. 15), the Shiloh of Jacob's blessing (Gen. xlix. 10), the Star and the Sceptre of Balaam's vision (Num. xxiv. 17; cf. John i. 21; Mal. iii. 1). He tells us too how they would fain, with or without his consent, have made Him their king; for they recognized the kingly, as well as the prophetic, character of their future Messiah (John i. 50): and, as St. John's word implies, would fain have hurried Him, willing or unwilling, to Jerusalem, and installed Him there in the royal seat of David.[1] It was not merely the power which He here displayed that moved them so mightily, but the fact that a miracle exactly of this character was looked for from the Messiah. He was to repeat, so to say, the miracles of Moses. As Moses, the first redeemer, had given bread of wonder to the people in the wilderness, even so should the later Redeemer do the same.[2] Thus too, when the first enthusiasm which this work had stirred was spent, the

[1] Godet: Le terme *ἁρπάζειν* ne permet pas douter que le projet ne fût de s'emparer de Jésus, même malgré lui, afin d'aller le couronner à Jérusalem. Cf. Acts viii. 39; 2 Cor. xii. 2; 1 Thess. iv. 17.

[2] Schoettgen (*Hor. Heb.* in loc., from the *Midrasch Coheleth*): Quemadmodum Goël primus, sic quoque erit postremus. Goël primus descendere fecit Man, q. d. Exod. xiv. 4, Et pluere faciam vobis panem de cælo. Sic quoque Goël postremus descendere facit Man, q. d. Ps. lxxii. 16, Erit multitudo frumenti super terram.

Jews compare it with what Moses had done, not any longer to find evidence here that as great or a greater prophet was among them, but invidiously to depress the present miracle by comparison with the past; and in the inferiority of the later to find proof that He who wrought it was no Messiah after all, with the right to rebuke and to command. 'What sign shewest Thou then, that we may see, and believe Thee? What dost *Thou* work? Our fathers did eat manna in the desert, as it is written, He gave them bread *from heaven* to eat' (John vi. 30, 31; cf. Exod. xvi. 4; Ps. lxxviii. 24); 'while the bread which Thou hast given,' for so much they would imply, 'is but this common bread of earth, wherewith Thou hast once nourished a few thousands.'[1]

But whatever resemblance may exist between that miracle and this, there is another in the Old Testament, one indeed already referred to, which this resembles more nearly, that namely which Elisha wrought, when with the twenty loaves of barley he satisfied a hundred men (2 Kin. iv. 42–44). All the *rudiments* of this miracle there appear;[2] the two substances, one artificial, one natural, from which the many persons are fed; as here bread and fish, so there bread and fresh ears of corn. As the disciples are incre-

[1] Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* iv. 21): Non uno die, sed annis quadraginta, nec de inferioribus materiis panis et piscis, sed de mannâ cælesti, nec quinque circiter sed sexcenta millia hominum protelavit.

[2] Tertullian notes this prefiguration of the miracles of Christ in those of his servants, against the Gnostics, who would fain have cut loose the New Testament from the Old, and found not merely distinction, but direct opposition, between them (*Adv. Marc.* iv. 21): Invenies totum hunc ordinem Christi circa illum Dei hominem, qui oblatos sibi viginti hordeaceos panes cum populo distribui jussisset, et minister ejus proinde comparatâ multitudine et pabuli mediocritate, respondisset, Quid ergo hoc dem in conspectu centum hominum? Da, inquit, et manducabant. . . . . O Christum et in novis veterem! Hæc itaque quæ viderat, Petrus, et cum pristinis comparat, et non tantum retro facta, sed et in futurum jam tunc prophetantia recognoverat, interroganti Domino, quisnam illis videretur, cum pro omnibus responderet, Tu es Christus, non potest non eum sensisse Christum, nisi quem noverat in Scripturis, quem jam recensebat in factis.

dulous here, so there the servitor asks, 'Should I set this before a hundred men?' As here twelve baskets of fragments remain, so there 'they did eat, and left thereof.' Yet were they only the weaker rudiments of this miracle; a circumstance which the difference between the servants and the Lord sufficiently explains. The prophets having grace only in measure, so in measure wrought their works; but the Son, working with infinite power, and with power not lent Him, but his own, did all with much superabundance.

17. *THE WALKING ON THE SEA.*

MATT. xiv. 22–33; MARK vi. 45–52; JOHN vi. 14–21.

THE three Evangelists who record this miracle agree to place it in immediate sequence to the feeding of the five thousand, and on the evening of the same day. The two earlier relate, that when all were fed, and the Lord was now about to dismiss the multitude, '*straightway He constrained his disciples to get into the ship.*' Why He should have found it necessary to '*constrain*' these, they do not tell us. Some vaguely suggest a general unwillingness on their part to be separated, even for a season, from their Lord;[1] such as demanded a certain loving violence on his part to overcome. But the true key to the phrase is obtained, when we compare the parallel record of St. John. There we learn that the multitude desired to take Jesus by force and make Him a king; and were so much in earnest about this, that, as the only means of defeating this purpose, '*He departed*[2] *again into a mountain Himself alone.*' The disciples could not avoid being aware of the shape which the popular enthusiasm, roused to the highest pitch by the recent miracle, was taking. This was exactly to their mind; it was precisely this which they had long hoped would arrive; so that they must have been most reluctant to quit their Master at the

[1] As Jerome: Compulit ut ascenderent naviculam, dum amore præceptoris ne punctum quidem temporis ab eo volunt separari. And Chrysostom: Τὸ ἠνάγκασεν δὲ εἶπεν, τὴν πολλὴν προσεδρίαν δεικνὺς τῶν μαθητῶν.

[2] For ἀνεχώρησεν here the Vulgate has fugit, which certainly appeared too strong a rendering; but the discovery of the Codex Sinaiticus, which rightly or wrongly for ἀνεχώρησεν reads φεύγει, has explained the mystery.

moment of his approaching exaltation. Thus, however, it must be, and while He dismisses the people, they must '*go before Him unto the other side*,' or '*unto Bethsaida*,' as St. Mark has it. There is no contradiction between this account and St. John's, that they '*went over the sea towards Capernaum*;' since this Bethsaida, not identical with that just before mentioned by St. Luke (ix. 10), and for distinction called Bethsaida Julias, but the city of Philip and Andrew and Peter (John i. 44), lay on the western side of the lake, in the same direction as Capernaum, and near to it; is indeed generally supposed to have been a fishing suburb of that town. St. Matthew, and St. Mark with him, make two evenings to this day,—one which had already commenced before the preparations for the feeding of the multitude had begun (ver. 15), the other now when the disciples had entered into the ship, and set forth on their voyage (ver. 23). And this was an ordinary way of counting among the Jews, the first evening being very much our afternoon (see Luke ix. 12, where the '*evening*' of Matthew and Mark is described as the season '*when the day began to wear away*'); the second evening[1] being the twilight, or from six o'clock to twilight; on which absolute darkness followed. It was the first evening, or afternoon, when the preparations for feeding the five thousand commenced; the second, when the disciples took ship.

'*And when He had sent the multitudes away, He went up into a mountain apart to pray; and when even was come, He was there alone.*' From thence, with the watchful eye of love, '*He saw them toiling in rowing*' (cf. Exod. iii. 7; Ps. lvi. 8); for in their Lord's absence they were able to make no effectual progress: '*the wind was contrary*,' and the sea rough: their sails, of course, could profit them nothing. It was now '*the fourth watch of the night*,' near morning

[1] Ὀψία δευτέρα.

therefore, and notwithstanding all their exertions they had not accomplished more than '*five and twenty or thirty furlongs*,' scarcely, that is, more than half of their way, the lake being forty or forty-five furlongs in breadth.[1] Probably they were finding themselves ever more unable to proceed, the danger probably was ever increasing, when suddenly they see their Lord '*walking on the sea*,'[2] and already close to their bark. It was his purpose in all the events of this night, as Chrysostom well brings out, to

[1] Thomson (*The Land and the Book*, pt. ii. c. 25): 'My experience in this region enables me to sympathize with the disciples in their long night's contest with the wind. I spent a night in that Wady Shukalyif, some three miles up it, to the left of us. The sun had scarcely set when the wind began to rush down toward the lake, and it continued all night long with constantly increasing violence, so that when we reached the shore next morning the face of the lake was like a huge boiling caldron. The wind howled down every wady from the north-east and east with such fury that no efforts of rowers could have brought a boat to shore at any point along that coast. In a wind like that, the disciples must have been driven quite across to Gennesaret, as we know they were.'

[2] Many have supposed that Lucian, in his account of the cork-footed race (φελλόποδες, *Ver. Hist.* ii. 4), whom he saw from his ship ἐπὶ τοῦ πελάγους διαθέοντας, intended a scoff at this miracle. I doubt whether so expert a scoffer, had he meant this, would not have done it better; still his hint (1, 2), that something lies under these absurd and extravagant travellers' tales which he has strung together, that they every one contain allusions to the fables and portents of poets and historians and *philosophers*, leaves it not altogether improbable; and in the *Philopseudes*, where there are more distinct side-glances at the miracles in the Gospels, —as for instance, a miraculously-healed man taking up his bed (11), the expulsion of the evil spirit from a demoniac (16), reminding one singularly of that recorded Mark ix. 14-29—this also of walking on the water recurs (13), among the incredible things proposed for the wise man's belief. The Golden City of the Blest, with its diamond walls, its floors of ivory, its vines bearing fruit every month (*Ver. Hist.* ii. 11-13), may very well be conceived in rivalry and in ridicule of the description of the New Jerusalem (Rev. xxi. 19; xxii. 2), as the story of a multitude of men comfortably housed for some years in the belly of a whale (*Ib.* i. 30-42) may be designed as an outdoing of Jonah's three days' abode in the same place. This last we know was an especial object of the flouts of the heathen; see Augustine (*Ep.* cii. qu. 6), and Josephus (*Antt.* ix. 10, § 2), who aiming to make his works acceptable to the educated heathen, gets over it with an 'as some say.' On the point of view from which Lucian contemplated Christianity see Krebs, *De Malitioso Luciani Consilio &c.* in his *Opusc. Acad.* p. 308; Tzschirner, *Fall des Heidenthums*, p. 320; and *Theol. Studien u. Kritiken*, 1851, pp. 826-902.

train his disciples to higher things than hitherto they had learned. That first storm, of which we have heard already (Matt. viii. 24), was by day, this by night. Then He was present in the ship with them; if it came to the worst, they knew that they might rouse Him; while the mere fact of his presence must have given them a sense of comparative security. But they must learn to walk by faith and not by sight; He will not have them as the ivy, needing always an external support, but as hardy forest-trees, which can brave a blast; and this time He puts them forth into the danger alone, even as some loving mother-bird thrusts her fledglings from the nest, that they may find their own wings and learn to use them. Nor shall the happy issue of all fail to waken in them an abiding confidence in his ever-ready help; for as his walking on the sea must have been altogether unimagined and unimaginable by them, they may have easily despaired of that help reaching them; but He, when He has tried them to the uttermost, '*in the fourth watch of the night*,' the same morning watch in which He had wrought of old another deliverance, not really more significant, though on a mightier scale (Exod. xiv. 24), appears beside them; thus teaching them for all their after life, in all coming storms of temptation, that He is near them; unseen it may be by their bodily eyes, yet indeed a very present help in the needful time of trouble; that heaviness may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning.

Nor should we miss the symbolic character which this whole transaction wears. As it fared with that bark upon those stormy billows, so fares it oftentimes with the Church, tossed to and fro on the waves of a troublesome world. It seems as though its Lord had forgotten it, so little is the way it makes; so baffled is it and tormented by hostile forces upon every side. But his eye is on it still; He is in the mountain apart praying; ever living, an ascended Saviour, to make intercession for his people. And when

at length the extremity of the need has arrived, He is suddenly with it, in marvellous ways past finding out; and then all that before was so laborious is easy, and the toiling rowers are anon at the haven where they would be.[1]

'*And when the disciples saw Him walking on the sea they were troubled, saying, It is a spirit;*[2] *and they cried out for fear.*' It is often so. Let that Lord only come to his people, as they have not hitherto known Him, in the shape of some affliction, in the way of some cross, and they recognize Him not. Their Lord, and charged with blessings for them, He yet seems to them as some terrible phantom of the night; and they too cry out for fear.[3] The disciples on this occasion might perhaps have pleaded that there was that in his approach to their bark, which would not allow them to recognize Him for what He was. He '*would have passed them by.*'[4] How could they suppose that this was their

[1] Thus Bede: Labor discipulorum in remigando et contrarius eis ventus labores sanctæ Ecclesiæ varios designat, quæ inter undas seculi adversantis et immundorum flatus spirituum ad quietem patriæ cælestis, quasi ad fidam litoris stationem, pervenire conatur. Ubi bene dicitur, quia navis erat in medio mari et ipse solus in terrâ; quia nonnunquam Ecclesia tantis Gentilium pressuris non solum afflicta, sed et fœdata est, ut, si fieri posset, Redemptor ipsius eam prorsus deseruisse ad tempus videretur. . . . Videt [tamen] Dominus laborantes in mari, quamvis ipse positus in terrâ; quia etsi ad horam differre videatur auxilium tribulatis impendere, nihilominus eos, ne in tribulationibus deficiant, suæ respectu pietatis corroborat, et aliquando etiam manifesto adjutorio, victis adversitatibus, quasi calcatis sedatisque fluctuum voluminibus, liberat. Cf. Augustine, *Serm.* lxxv. So too Anselm (*Hom.* iii.): Nam quia insurgunt fluctus, potest ista navicula turbari, sed quia Christus orat, non potest mergi.

[2] *Φάντασμα* (cf. Wisd. xvii. 15, LXX.) = *φάσμα νυκτερινόν* (Job xx. 8, LXX.). The rendering of this word by 'spirit,' as in our A.V., is certainly not altogether satisfactory; but 'apparition' (R.V.) as little.

[3] Bengel: Turbati sunt. Sæpe Christum pro alio potius quam pro Christo habemus.

[4] Calvin: Pii audito ejus nomine, quod illis est certum et divini amoris et suæ salutis pignus, quasi a morte in vitam excitati animos colligunt, et quasi serenum cælum hilares conspiciunt, quieti in terrâ resident, et omnium malorum victores ejus præsidium omnibus periculis opponunt.

Lord, hastening to the help of his own? The circumstance perplexed *them* for a moment; it has perplexed others lastingly. Such as are on the watch to detect inner inconsistencies in the Gospels have asked, 'Why appear to pass them by and to escape them, when the only aim of his coming was to re-assure and to aid them? when He so little really meant to escape them, that no sooner was He recognized and detained by their cries, than He went up into the ship where they were?' Doubtless this, as so many other dealings of God with his servants, is hard to be understood of those to whom the life of faith is altogether strange. He will seem to pass them by, appear to forsake them; and so evoke their prayer and their cry, that He would *not* pass them by, that He would *not* forsake them.[1] Not otherwise, walking with his two disciples to Emmaus, after his resurrection, 'He made as though He would have gone further' (Luke xxiv. 28), thus drawing out from them the entreaty that He would abide. It is evermore thus; we have here no exceptional dealing, but one finding its analogies everywhere in the Scripture and in the Christian life. What part does Christ sustain here different from that which in the parable of the Unjust Judge (Luke xviii. 2), or the churlish Friend (Luke xi. 5), He ascribes to God? or different from that which He Himself sustained when He came not to the help of the sisters of Bethany in what seemed the utmost extremity of their need (John xi. 6)? And are not all the complaints of the faithful in the Psalms, as that God hides his face, that He gives them into the hands of their enemies, that He is absent from them so long, confessions that He does so deal with his own,

[1] Augustine (*De Cons. Evang.* ii. 47): Quomodo ergo eos volebat præterire, quos paventes ita confirmat, nisi quia illa voluntas prætereundi ad eliciendum illum clamorem valebat, cui subveniri oportebat? Corn. a Lapide: Volebat præterire eos, quasi eos non curans, nec ad eos pertinens, sed alio pergens, ut in eis metum et clamorem excitaret.

that by delaying and seeming to pass them by, He quickens their faith, and calls out their prayers that He would come to them soon, and abide with them always?

And now, as one by that cry of distress arrested and detained, He at once scatters and rebukes their fears: '*Straightway Jesus spake unto them, saying, Be of good cheer; it is I; be not afraid.*' How often has He to speak this word of encouragement even to his own; almost always when they are brought suddenly or in any unusual way face to face with Him (Gen. xv. 1; xxi. 17; xxvi. 24; Jud. vi. 23; Dan. x. 12, 19; Matt. xvii. 7; xxviii. 5; Luke i. 20; ii. 10; Rev. i. 17). And now follows that characteristic rejoinder of Peter, which, with all that follows from it, St. Matthew alone records: '*Lord, if it be Thou, bid me come unto Thee on the water.*' That '*if*' must not be interpreted as implying a doubt whether it was the Lord or not. A Thomas, indeed, may have required to have Jesus with him in the ship, before he would fully believe that it was no phantom, but his very Lord; Peter's fault would be of another kind. His words mean rather: '*Since* it is Thou, command me to come unto Thee;' for he feels rightly that Christ's command must go before his own coming. And, doubtless, it was the promptness and forwardness of love which made him ask for this command, which made him desire to be where his Lord was (John xxi. 7). Perhaps, too, he would fain compensate for that exclamation of terror in which he had joined with the rest, by an heroic act of courage and affiance. And yet there was a fault in all this, as the issue proved; such as made the whole incident a rehearsal of the greater presumption and the more serious fall in store for the too confident disciple (Matt. xxvi. 33, 70). In that '*Bid me*,' the fault may be found. He will outdo and outdare the other disciples; will signalize himself by a mightier testimony of faith than any one of them will venture to render.

It is but in another shape, 'Although all shall be offended, yet will not I.'

Let us observe, and with reverence admire, the wisdom and love of the Lord's answer. Another, with enough of spiritual insight to detect what was amiss in Peter's proposal, might yet by less skilful treatment have marred all, and lost for him the lessons it so much behoved him to learn. Had his Lord, for example, commanded him to remain where he was, He would at once have checked the outbreaks of his fervent spirit, which, when purified from the carnal that mingled with them, were to carry him so far, and caused him to miss the instruction which through his partial failure was in store for him. But with more gracious and discriminating wisdom the great Master of souls; who yet, knowing what the event must prove, pledges not Himself for the issue of his coming. Peter had said, '*Bid me*;' there is no 'I bid,' in the Lord's reply. Peter had said, '*come unto Thee*;' the '*unto Me*' disappears from the Lord's answer; which is only '*Come*;' that is, 'if thou wilt; make the experiment, if thou desirest.' It is a merely permissive '*Come*;' like Joab's 'Run' to Ahimaaz (2 Sam. xviii. 22). Doubtless it contained an implicit pledge that Peter should not be wholly swallowed up by the waves, but none for the successful issue of the feat; which all would in very faithfulness have been involved, had the Lord's words been the entire echo of his disciple's. What the issue should be, depended upon Peter himself,—whether he should keep the beginning of his confidence firm unto the end. And He who knew what was in man, knew that he would not; that this was not the pure courage of faith; that what of carnal over-boldness there was in it would infallibly be exchanged, when the stress of the trial came, for fear and unbelief.

It was even so. '*And when Peter was come down out of the ship, he walked on the water, to go to Jesus.*' This for a

while; so long as he looked to his Lord and to Him only, he also was able to walk upon the unsteady surface of the sea, to tread upon the *waters*, which for him also were not *waves*. But when he took counsel of flesh and blood, when he saw something else besides Jesus, then, because '*he saw the wind boisterous, he was afraid; and beginning to sink*,[1] *he cried, saying, Lord, save me.*' He who had thought to make a show before all the other disciples of a courage which transcended theirs, must now in the presence of them all confess his terror, and reveal the weakness, as he had thought to display the strength, of his faith. In this moment of peril his swimmer's art (John xxi. 7) profits him nothing; for there is no mingling in this way of nature and of grace. He who has entered the wonder-world of grace must not suppose that he may withdraw from it at any moment that he will, and betake himself to his old resources of nature. He has forgotten these, and must carry through what he has begun, or fail at his peril.

But Peter has to do with One who will not allow him greatly to fall.[2] His experience shall be that of the Psalmist: 'When I said, My foot slippeth, thy mercy, O Lord, held me up.'[3] His '*Lord, save me*,' is answered at once. '*Immediately Jesus stretched forth his hand, and caught him.*'[4] And then how gracious the rebuke! '*O thou of little faith!*' He does not say 'of none!' and '*Wherefore didst thou doubt?*' not 'Wherefore didst thou come?' thus, instead of checking, as He then would have

[1] Καταποντίζεσθαι = βυθίζεσθαι, Luke v. 7; 1 Tim. vi. 9.

[2] A proverbial medieval line,

Mergere nos patitur, sed non submergere, Christus,

was probably suggested by this miracle.

[3] Augustine very beautifully brings together those words of the Psalmist and this incident, making them mutually to illustrate one another (*Enarr. in Ps.* xciii. 18).

[4] Sedulius:

Cui portus fuit illa manus, pelagique viator
Libera per vitreos movit vestigia campos.

done, the future impulses of his servant's boldness, encouraging them rather; showing him how he could do all things through Christ strengthening him, and that his error lay, not in undertaking too much, but in relying too little upon that strength which would have triumphantly borne him through all.[1] And not until by that sustaining hand He has restored confidence to the fearful one, and made him feel that he can indeed tread under foot those waves of the unquiet sea, does He speak even this word of a gentle rebuke. The courage of the disciple has already returned, so that the Master speaks of his doubt as of something which is already past: '*Wherefore didst thou doubt?* Before the doubt arose in thy heart, thou didst walk on these waves, and now that thy faith has returned, thou dost walk on them again; thou seest that it is not impossible, that it lies but in thy faithful will; that all things are possible to him that believeth.'

We must look at this episode of the miracle as itself also symbolic. Peter represents to us here the faithful of all times in the seasons of their unfaithfulness and fear. So long as they are strong in faith, they are able to tread under foot the most turbulent agitations of an unquiet world; but when they are afraid, when, instead of 'looking unto Jesus,' they look at the stormy winds and waters, anon these prevail against them, and they begin to sink; and were it not for their Lord's sustaining hand, stretched out in answer to their cry, they would be wholly overwhelmed and swallowed up.[2]

[1] Bengel: Non reprehenditur quod exierit e navi, sed quod non manserit in firmitate fidei.

[2] Augustine (*Enarr. in Ps.* xxxix. 6): Calca mare, ne mergaris in mari. And again (*Serm.* lxxxvi. 6): Attendite seculum quasi mare, ventus validus et magna tempestas. Unicuique sua cupiditas, tempestas est. Amas Deum, ambulas super mare: sub pedibus tuis est seculi tumor. Amas seculum, absorbebit te. Amatores suos vorare novit, non portare. Sed cum fluctuat cupiditate cor tuum, ut vincas tuam cupiditatem, invoca Christi divinitatem. . . . Et si motus est pes tuus, si titubas, si aliqua non superas, si mergi incipis, dic, Domine, pereo, libera me. Dic, Domine, pereo, ne pereas. Solus enim a morte carnis liberat

'*And when they were come into the ship, the wind ceased.*' Those on the watch for discrepancies between one Evangelist and another are pleased here to discover such, between St. Matthew and St. Mark on one side, and St. John on the other. If, they say, we are to believe the former, the Lord did now with his disciple go up into the ship; if, on the contrary, we accept the narrative of St. John, we must then suppose that the disciples were *willing* to receive Him; but did not so in fact, the ship being rapidly, and, as would seem to be implied, with miraculous swiftness, brought to the land. The whole question turns on the words which we translate, and I have no doubt rightly as regards the circumstance which actually took place, '*they willingly received Him into the ship.*' It is quite true they would be more literally rendered, '*they were willing to receive Him into the ship*;'[1] but with the

te, qui mortuus est in carne pro te. And again: Titubatio ista, fratres, quasi mors fidei fuit. Sed ubi exclamavit, fides iterum resurrexit. Non ambularet, nisi crederet, sed nec mergeretur, nisi dubitaret. In Petro itaque communis omnium nostrûm consideranda conditio, ut si nos in aliquo tentationum ventus conatur subvertere, vel unda submergere, clamemus ad Christum. Cf. *De Cant. Novo*, 2.

[1] The A. V. would have done better if, following the earlier English Versions, it had so rendered ἤθελον λαβεῖν αὐτόν. Probably to Beza's influence we owe the change. For voluerunt recipere eum of the Vulgate he substitutes volente animo receperunt eum, and defends the translation thus: Itaque verbum ἤθελον opponitur ei quod ante dixerat, eos videlicet fuisse perterritos: ex quo intelligitur ipsos initio fuisse eum aversatos, nunc vero agnitâ ejus voce et mutatis animis eum quem fugiebant, cupide accepisse in navem. This is perfectly true; yet had the passage been left, '*they were willing to receive Him*,' none reading this Gospel of St. John in the light of the other two, could doubt that this willingness, which, now when they recognized their Master, they felt, issued in the actual receiving of Him: and none could accuse our Translators of going out of their way to bring about a harmony, which in the original did not so evidently exist. That θέλειν means often to wish to do a thing *and to do* it, hardly needs proof. Thus Matt. xviii. 23, a king desired to take account (ἠθέλησε συνᾶραι λόγον) with his servants, and, as we know, from the sequel, did so; again, John i. 43, Jesus desired to go forth into Galilee (ἠθέλησεν ἐξελθεῖν), and, as we learn ii. 2, actually went; the Scribes desire to walk in long robes (Mark xii. 38) and do so. The word may quite as well imply an accomplished, as a baulked, desire (cf. Luke xx. 46; 1 Cor. x. 27; Col.

implicit understanding that what they were willing to do, they actually did. Those who a little before cried out with fear at his approach, as though it had been a spirit, were now glad[1] to receive Him in their midst, and did so receive Him; '*and immediately the ship was at the land whither they went.*'[2]

St. Mark, as his wont is (cf. ii. 12; v. 42; vii. 37; ix. 15), records the infinite astonishment of the disciples at all which they witnessed; '*they were sore amazed in themselves beyond measure, and wondered*;' while from St. Matthew we learn that the impression was not limited to them alone; for '*they that were in the ship*,' others who were sailing with them, sailors and passengers,[3] caught a momentary glimpse of the greatness of Him in whose presence they stood; and '*came and worshipped Him, saying, Of a truth Thou art the Son of God*' (cf. John i. 49; Matt. xxvii. 54).

ii. 18). It is true that we have an imperfect, the tense oftentimes of uncompleted action, here; yet considering the words which directly follow, '*and immediately the ship was at the land whither they went*,' and the impossibility that St. John can mean that this desire of theirs *was defeated* by the instantaneous arrival of the ship at the land, or that he can intend to ascribe that arrival to any other cause except to the fact that Christ was now in the ship, we may safely put back any argument derived from the use of the imperfect here. It is of this passage that a recent assailant of the credibility of our Gospels has written, 'By the irreconcilable contradiction between John and the synoptic Evangelists in the matter of receiving Christ into the ship, one or other account *must* be given up.' To be sure he does his best to make a contradiction, if he cannot find one; affirming that καὶ in the second clause of ver. 21 must be taken *adversativè*,—'they were willing to receive Him into the ship, *but* straightway the ship was at the land:' and De Wette, *Aber* alsbald war das Schiff am Lande. Ewald in like manner sees in St. John a rectification, and not a confirmation, of the account given by the earlier Evangelists; but Baumlein, one of the latest commentators on St. John, and one troubled with no particular anxiety to make the Evangelists agree together, rightly: Dass εὐθέως ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς als Folge seines Einsteigens, ist wohl nicht zu bezweifeln.

[1] Grotius: Non quod non receperunt, sed quod cupide admodum, ut Syrus indicat.

[2] Καὶ ὡδήγησεν αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ λιμένα θελήματος αὐτῶν are the beautiful words with which what may be called an Old Testament prophecy of this scene concludes (Ps. cvii. 23–30, LXX).

[3] Jerome: Nautæ atque vectores.

They felt more or less clearly that here was One who stood in wonderful relation with HIM of whom it is written, 'Thy way is in the sea, and thy path in the great waters, and thy footsteps are not known' (Ps. lxxvii. 19); 'Thou didst walk through the sea with thine horses, through the heap of great waters' (Hab. iii. 15); 'Which alone spreadeth out the heavens, *and treadeth upon the waves of the sea*' (Job ix. 8[1]).

It is a docetic[2] view of the person of Christ, which conceives of his body as permanently exempt from the law of gravitation, and in this way explains the miracle; a hard and mechanical view, which places the seat of the miracle in the waters rendered solid under his feet. Rather was it *the will* of Christ, which bore Him triumphantly above those waters; even as it was the will of Peter, that will, indeed, made in the highest degree active and potential by faith in the Son of God, which should in like manner have enabled him to walk on the great deep, and, though with partial and transient failure, did so enable him. It has been already urged[3] that the miracle, according to its true idea, is not the suspension, still less the

[1] Ὁ περιπατῶν, ὡς ἐπ' ἐδάφους, ἐπὶ θαλάσσης, LXX. Eusebius (*Dem. Evang* ix. 12) finds a special fulfilment of these words in this miracle, as also in these waves the symbol of a mightier and wilder sea, even that of sin and death, which Christ trod under his feet when He, in a far higher sense than that in which the words were first spoken,

> . . . . metus omnes et inexorabile fatum
> *Subjecit pedibus*, strepitumque Acherontis avari;

and he quotes Ps. lxxiv. 13, 14: 'Thou didst divide the sea by thy strength, Thou brakest the heads of the dragons in the waters; Thou brakest the heads of leviathan in pieces, and gavest him to be meat to the people inhabiting the wilderness;' and Job xxxviii. 16, 17, where the Almighty says to man: 'Hast *thou* entered into the springs of the sea? or hast *thou* walked in the search of the depth? Have the gates of death been opened unto *thee*, and hast *thou* seen the doors of the shadow of death?'

[2] The Cathari, a Gnostic sect of the Middle Ages, actually appealed to this miracle in confirmation of their errors concerning the body of Christ, as a heavenly, and not a truly human, body (Neander, *Kirch. Gesch.* vol. v. p. 1126).

[2] See pp. 15, 73.

violation of law; but the incoming of a higher law, as of a spiritual in the midst of natural laws; and so far as its range and reach extend, the assertion for that higher law, of the predominance which it was intended to have, and but for man's fall it would always have had, over the lower; and with this a prophetic anticipation of the abiding predominance which it shall one day recover. Exactly thus was there here a sign of the lordship of man's will, when that will is in absolute harmony with God's will, over external nature. In regard of this very law of gravitation, a feeble remnant of his power, and one for the most part unconsciously possessed, survives to man in the unquestionable fact that his body is lighter when he is awake than sleeping;[1] a fact which every nurse who has carried a child can attest. From this we conclude that the human consciousness, as an inner centre, works as an opposing force to the attraction of the earth and the centripetal force of gravity, however unable in this present time to overbear it.[2]

[1] It was noticed long ago by Pliny, *H. N.* vii. 18.

[2] See Homer, *Il.* xiii. 28: *οὐκ ἠγνοίησεν ἄνακτα.* Prudentius (*Apotheosis*, 655) has some sounding lines upon this miracle:

> Ipse super fluidas plantis nitentibus undas
> Ambulat, ac presso firmat vestigia fluctu;
> Increpat Ipse notos, et flatibus otia mandat;
> Ninguidus agnoscit Boreas atque imbrifer Eurus
> Nimborum dominum, tempestatumque potentem,
> Excitamque hyemem verrunt ridente sereno.

18. *THE OPENING OF THE EYES OF ONE BORN BLIND.*

JOHN ix.

IT is on the whole most probable that this work of grace and power crowned the day of that long debate with Jewish adversaries, which, beginning at John vii. 34, reaches to the end of chapter x.;—the history of the woman taken in adultery being only an interruption, and an intercalation easily betraying itself as such. Our Lord then, as He passed from the temple, to escape those stones which were the last arguments of his foes (viii. 59), will have paused—probably in the immediate neighbourhood of the temple, where beggars, cripples, and other afflicted persons took their station (Acts iii. 2, 10), to accomplish this miracle. Nothing in the narrative indicates a break. That long 'contradiction of sinners' which the Lord endured found place, we know, on a Sabbath, the last day of the feast of tabernacles (vii. 37) being always such; and on a Sabbath, to all appearance the same Sabbath, He opened this blind man's eyes (ix. 14). Moved by these reasons, the ancient interpreters see here a narrative continuous and unbroken, and with them most of the modern consent.[1]

It has been by some objected, that, first concealing Himself, and then escaping for his life (John viii. 59), He must have left the temple alone; while so far from this, his disciples are here in his company. But what more natural than that they also should have extricated themselves, though not in the same wonderful manner as He

[1] As Maldonatus, Tittmann, Tholuck, Olshausen.

did, from the tumult of the people, and have rejoined their Master without? If it be further urged that this work was wrought in a more leisurely manner, with more apparent freedom from all fear of interruption than could well have been, had He only just withdrawn from the extreme malice of the Jews, we may rather accept this as a beautiful evidence of his fearless walk in the midst of foes; so that not even such a time as this, when He had but just escaped the Jewish stones, seemed to Him unfitted for a task of mercy and love. And may not something of all this lie in ver. 4, 5? 'I must work this work now, however out of season it may seem: for the night which my enemies are bringing on, is near, and then the opportunity for working will be over;' with which words we may compare the exactly parallel passage, John xi. 7–10.

But how, it has been sometimes urged, could the disciples know of this man that he '*was blind from his birth*'?[1] He was evidently a well-known beggar in Jerusalem, with whose tale many were acquainted (ver. 8; cf. Acts iii. 2); he may further have himself proclaimed his lifelong calamity, with the object of stirring pity in the passers-by. One way or other the fact had come to the knowledge of the disciples, and out of it their question grew. Perplexed at this more than ordinary calamity, they ask their Master to explain to them its cause: '*Who did sin, this man, or his parents, that he was born blind?*' But what they had in their minds when they suggested the former alternative, namely that a man for his *own* sins should have been *born* blind, has naturally enough been often demanded.

Three or four explanations have been offered: the first, that the Jews believed in a transmigration of souls; and thus that the sins which the disciples assumed as possible explanations of his blindness, were those of some anterior

[1] Ἐκ γενετῆς = ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός, Acts iii. 2; xiv. 8. There, as here, a lifelong defect is removed.

life,—antenatal sins, which were being punished and expiated now. This, as is well known, is the doctrine of the Buddhists; and is woven into the very heart of their religious system: but it cannot be proved that there was any such belief among the Jews. It may have been the dream of a few philosophic Jews, who had obtained some acquaintance with the speculations of the East, but was never the faith of plain and simple men. This explanation therefore may be regarded as altogether antiquated, and without more discussion set aside.[1]

Lightfoot adduces evidence to show that the Jews believed a child might sin in its mother's womb, in proof of which their Rabbis referred to the struggle between Jacob and Esau (Gen. xxv. 22); and he, and others after him, persuade themselves that out of this popular belief the question of the disciples grew.

Tholuck, following an earlier interpreter, supposes their notion to have been that God had foreknown some great sin which this man would commit, and so by anticipation had punished him for this. But as such a dealing on God's part is altogether without analogy in Scripture, so is there not the slightest hint that men had ever fallen on it as an explanation of the suffering in the world; nor, indeed, could they: for while the idea of retribution is one of the deepest in the human heart, this of punishment running before the crime which it punishes, is one from which it as strongly revolts.

Chrysostom imagines that in this question of theirs there lay a *reductio ad absurdum* of the argument which connects sin and suffering together. The man could not have brought this penalty on himself; for he was born with it. His parents could not by their sin have brought it on him; for we know that each man shall bear his own burden, that the children's teeth are not set on edge because the

[1] The passages from the *Wisdom of Solomon* (viii. 19, 20) and Josephus (*B. J.* ii. 8, 14) are misunderstood, when applied in this sense.

parents have eaten sour grapes (Ezek. xviii. 2, 20). But this has little likelihood in it. Honest and simple-hearted men, like those who asked this question, would have been the last to seek escape from a truth, to which all that was deepest in their own hearts bore witness, by an ingenious dilemma.

Rather, I believe, they failed to perceive, at the moment when they asked their question, the self-contradiction involved in the first alternative which they put before their Lord; so that, while they rightly, and by a most true moral instinct, discerned the intimate connexion in which the world's sin and the world's suffering stand to one another, yet in this case they did not realize how it must have been the sin and suffering, not of this individual man, but of him as making part of a great whole, which were thus connected together. They did not at the moment perceive that the mere fact of this calamity reaching back to his birth at once excluded and condemned the uncharitable suspicion, that wherever there was a more than ordinary sufferer, there was also a more than ordinary sinner,—leaving only the most true thought, that a great sin must be cleaving to a race, of which any member could so greatly suffer.

This, as it is continually affirmed in Scripture, so we cannot suppose that our Lord intended to deny it. His words, '*Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents*,'—or better, '*Neither did this man, nor his parents, sin*,'—words which need for their completion—'that he should have been born blind,' neither deny the man's own sin, nor that of his parents; they as little deny that sicknesses are oftentimes the punishment of sins (Deut. xxviii. 22; Lev. xxvi. 16; 1 Cor. xi. 30; Jam. v. 15), or that the sins of parents are often visited on their children (Exod. xx. 5). All that the Lord does is to check in his disciples that most harmful practice of diving down with cruel surmises into the secrets of other men's lives, and, like the friends

of Job, ascribing to them great transgressions, hidden, it might be, from men, but not hidden from God, in explanation of their unusual sufferings (Job iv. 7; viii. 6). 'This blindness,' He would say, 'is the chastening of no *peculiar* sin on his own part, nor on his parents'. Seek, therefore, its cause elsewhere; see what nobler explanation the evil in the world, and this evil in particular, is capable of receiving. The purpose of the lifelong blindness of this man is *that the works of God should be made manifest in him*; that through it and its removal the grace and glory of God might be magnified.' Not, indeed, as though this man had been used merely *as a means*, visited with this blindness to the end that the power of God in Christ might be manifested to others in its removal.[1] The manifestation of the works of God has here a wider reach; it includes, indeed, the manifestation of those works to the world and *on* the man; but it does not exclude, rather of necessity includes, their manifestation also *to* him and *in* him. It entered into the plan of God for the bringing of this man to the light of everlasting life, that he should thus for a while be dark outwardly; that so upon this darkness, and upon the darkness of his heart, a higher light might break, and the Sun of righteousness arise on him, with healing in his wings for all his bodily and all his spiritual infirmities; which, except for that long night of darkness and sorrow, might have never been: while again this was part of a larger whole, and fitted in, according to his eternal counsels, to the great scheme for the revelation of the glory and power of the Only-begotten to the world (cf. John xi. 4; Rom. v. 20; ix. 17; xi. 25, 32, 33).[2]

At the same time we must not accept this as the entire and exhaustive solution of this man's blindness. For it is

[1] Leo the Great (*Serm.* 45): Quod principiis naturæ non dederat, ad manifestationem suæ gloriæ reservârat.

[2] Compare Jeremy Taylor, *Life of Christ*, part 3, sect. 14; disc. 18.

the pantheistic explanation of evil, that it is not really evil, but only the condition of a higher good, and the transition to it; only appearing as evil at all from a low standing-point, and one which as yet knows and sees only in part. This explanation of the world's evil, tempting as it has shown itself to many, is not the explanation which the Scripture offers. This ever recognizes the reality of evil; and this, even while that evil, through the boundless resources of the Divine love, magnifies more the glory of the Creator, and ultimately exalts higher the blessedness of the creature. This cannot, then, be the whole explanation of the blindness which this man had brought with him into the world; but God, who, though not the author, is yet the disposer, of evil,—who distributes that which He did not Himself bring in, and distributes it according to the counsels of his wisdom and righteousness and grace, had willed that on this man should be concentrated more than the ordinary penalties of the world's universal sin, that a more than ordinary grace and glory might be revealed in their removing.

With this the Lord girds up Himself to the work which is before Him, and justifies Himself in undertaking it: '*I must work the works of Him that sent Me*,[1] *while it is day*;' or, adopting the preferable reading, '*We must work the works of Him that sent Me, while it is day*,' the Lord associating the disciples in this blessed work with Himself; so the R. V.; '*The night cometh, when no man can work*' (cf. xi. 9, 10; Rom. xiii. 12). Whatever perils attended that work, yet it must be accomplished; for his time, '*the day*' of his open activity, of his walking up and down among men, and doing them good, was drawing to an end. '*The night*,' when He should no longer lighten the world with his presence, nor have the opportunity of working, with his own hands at least, works like these, was approaching.

[1] This was a favourite passage with the Arians; see Augustine, *Serm.* cxxxv. 1–4, and his answer there to their abusive interpretation.

The image is borrowed from our common day and our common night, of which the former is the time appointed for labour, 'man goeth forth to his work until the evening' (Ps. cix. 23); while the latter, by its darkness, opposes to many kinds of labour obstacles insurmountable. The difficulty which Olshausen finds in the words, '*when no man can work*,' inasmuch as, however Christ was Himself withdrawn from the earth, yet his disciples did effectually work,[1] rises solely from his missing the point of the proverbial phrase. Our Lord does not affirm 'The night cometh, in which no *other* man can work; in which no work can be done;' but only, in the language of a familiar proverb which is as true for the heavenly kingdom as for this present world, 'No man who has not done *his* work in the day, can do it in the night; *for him* the time cometh in which he cannot work;' and He does not exclude even Himself from this law.[2] And then, with prophetic allusion to the work before Him, '*As long as I am in the world, I am the light of the world* (cf. i. 4); what work then will become Me better than this of opening the blind eyes? where should I find so fit a symbol of my greater spiritual work, the restoring of the darkened spiritual vision of mankind?'[3]

And now He who at the old creation had said, 'Let there be light, and there was light' (Gen. i. 3), will in this, a little fragmentary specimen of the new creation which hereafter shall be, display the same almighty power.

[1] The same difficulty strikes Augustine: Numquid nox erat, quando claudus ille ad verbum Petri salvus effectus est, immo ad verbum Domini habitantis in Petro? Numquid nox erat, quando transeuntibus discipulis ægri cum lectulis ponebantur, ut vel umbrâ transeuntium tangerentur?

[2] The power of triviality can reach no further than it has reached in the exposition of Paulus Christ is for him no more than a skilful oculist, who says, 'I must take this cure in hand while there is yet daylight to see; for when it is dark I could not attempt so fine and delicate an operation.'

[3] So Cyril: *Ἐπείπερ ἀφῖγμαι φωτίσων τὰ ἐν ἐνδείᾳ φωτὸς, δεῖ με καὶ τοῖς τοῦ σώματος τὸ φῶς μεταδοῦναι.*

'*When He had thus spoken, He spat on the ground, and made clay of the spittle, and He anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay.*' A medicinal value was attributed in old time to saliva, above all for disorders in the eyes;[1] it is similarly used in the case of another blind man (Mark viii. 23), and of one suffering from a defect in the organs of speech and hearing (Mark vii. 33); neither are we altogether without examples of a medicinal use of clay.[2] Still we must not suppose that, *besides* his divine power, the Lord *also* used natural remedies, or that these were more than conductors, not in themselves needful, but such as of his own free will He assumed, as channels to convey his grace (cf. 2 Kin. iv. 41; Isai. xxxviii. 21); for other blind eyes He opened without employing any such means (Matt. ix. 27–30; xx. 30–34). Probably the reasons which induced their use were ethical. It may have been a help to the weak faith of this man to find that something external was done. Nor may we leave out of sight a symbolic reference to Gen. ii. 7. The same creative hand which wrought at the beginning is again at work.[3]

[1] Pliny (*H. N.* xxviii. 7) says, Lippitudines matutinâ quotidie velut inunctione salivæ jejunæ arceri. In both accounts (Suetonius, *Vespas.* 7; Tacitus, *Hist.* iv. 8) of that restoring of a blind man to sight, attributed to Vespasian, the use of this remedy occurs. In the latter the man begs of the emperor, ut genas et oculorum orbes dignaretur respergere oris excremento; and abundant quotations to the same effect are to be found in Wetstein (in loc.)

[2] Thus Serenus Samonicus, a physician in the time of Caracalla:

> Si tumor insolitus typho se tollat inani,
> Turgentes oculos vili circumline cœno.

In this healing by clay, being as it is that very thing which (in the shape of dust) most often afflicts and wounds the eyes, Augustine (*In Ev. Joh. tract.* ii.) finds a striking analogy with the healing of flesh through flesh, our flesh through Christ's flesh: Gloriam ejus nemo posset videre, nisi carnis humilitate sanaretur. Unde non poteramus videre? Irruerat homini quasi pulvis in oculum, irruerat terra, sauciaverat oculum, videre non poterat lucem: oculus ille sauciatus inunguitur: terrâ sauciatus erat, et terra illuc mittitur, ut sanetur. . . . De pulvere cæcatus es, de pulvere sanaris: ergo caro te cæcaverat, caro te sanat.

[3] Irenæus has here one of his profound observations. Having referred to ver. 3, '*that the works of God should be made manifest in him*,' he goes

This done, Christ '*said unto him, Go, wash in the pool of Siloam.*' The command was certainly something more than a mere test of obedience. Was the cure itself to result, altogether, or in part, from that washing? Or was the tempered clay the sole agent of healing, and the washing merely designed to remove the hindrances which the remedy itself, if suffered to remain, would have opposed even to restored organs of vision? Our answer to these questions must in good part depend on the answer we give to another—this namely, Did St. John see anything significant and mystical in the name of the pool, that he should add for his Greek readers an interpretation of it, '*which is by interpretation, Sent*'? Did he trace any symbolic meaning in Christ's sending of the man to a pool bearing such a name? If so, one can scarcely doubt that it was his intention to connect the actual cure with the washing in that pool. But how can we suppose that St. John did *not* see a prophetic significance in the name '*Siloam*,' or that, except for this, he would have paused to insert in his narrative the meaning of the word (cf. i. 38, 42)? which, proper enough in a lexicon, would have been quite out of place in a Gospel? Those who admit this much, yet differ among themselves as to what the exact allusion may be. Olshausen cannot find in '*Sent*' a reference to Christ Himself, seeing that He was not upon this occasion the '*Sent*,' but the Sender. There seems to me no force in the objection. Christ, the Sender

on to say (v. 15): Scriptura ait, Sumsit Deus limum de terrâ, et plasmavit hominem. Quapropter et Dominus exspuit in terram, et fecit lutum, et superlinivit illud oculis; ostendens antiquam plasmationem quemadmodum facta est, et manum Dei manifestans his qui intelligere possint, per quam e limo plasmatus est homo. Prudentius (*Apotheosis*, 689) gives the same reason for the employment of the clay:

> Nôrat enim limo sese informâsse figuram
> Ante tenebrosam, proprii medicamen et oris
> Adjecisse novo, quem primum finxerat, Adæ;
> Nam sine divino Domini perflamine summi
> Arida terra fuit nulli prius apta medelæ.

indeed in this particular instance, was the Sent of God, when we contemplate his work as a whole;[1] so He ever contemplated it Himself (John iii. 17, 34; v. 36, 38; vii. 29; viii. 42); bearing therefore this very title, 'the *Apostle*[2] of our profession' (Heb. iii. 1). These waters of Siloam, in which the blind man washed and was illuminated, may well have been to St. John a type of the waters of baptism (cf. 1 Pet. iii. 21), or indeed of all the operations of grace by which the eyes spiritually blind are opened; the very name of the pool having therefore for him a presaging fitness, which by this notice he would stamp as more than accidental.[3]

The man is no Naaman, resenting the simplicity of the means by which his cure should be effected, and with difficulty persuaded to be healed (2 Kin. v. 11, 13). He at once fulfilled the conditions imposed: '*he went his way therefore, and washed, and came seeing*' (cf. xi. 37); returned, probably to the place where the Lord had met him; but not finding Him there, went to his own house. The miracle arouses before long no little attention. His neighbours and those familiar with his former life are the first to take note of the cure;—persons, as would appear, not ill disposed, but altogether under the influence of the Pharisees. They

[1] Augustine (*Serm.* cxxxv. 1): Quis est ipse Missus, nisi qui dixit in ipsâ lectione, Ego, inquit, veni ut faciam opera ejus qui misit me; and *In Ev. Joh. tract.* xliv.: Misit illum ad piscinam quæ vocatur Siloë. Pertinuit autem ad Evangelistam commendare nobis nomen hujus piscinæ, et ait, Quod interpretatur Missus. Jam quis sit Missus agnoscitis: nisi enim ille fuisset missus, nemo nostrûm esset ab iniquitate dimissus. So Chrysostom, *Hom.* lvii. *in Joh.*; and Basil the Great: Τίς οὖν ὁ ἀπεσταλμένος καὶ ἀψοφητὶ ῥέων, ἢ περὶ οὗ εἴρηται, Κύριος ἀπέσταλκέ με· καὶ πάλιν, οὐκ ἐρίσει οὐδὲ κραυγάσει;

[2] Ἀπόστολος, as compared with ἀπεσταλμένος here.

[3] Bengel: Nomen huic loco inditum pridem, quia Jesus Christus eo missurus erat cæcum. Compare Tholuck, *Beiträge zur Spracherklärung des Neuen Testaments*, p. 123. The pool of Siloam, which received the waters of the fountain of the same name, is often mentioned by Josephus; and twice in the Old Testament, 'the waters of Shiloah' (Isai. viii. 6), 'the pool of Siloah' (Nehem. iii. 15). See the admirable article, *Siloam*, in the *Dict. of the Bible*; and Westcott's *St. John*, at this place.

wonder, debate whether it be indeed he whom they had known so long; for the opening of the eyes, those windows of the soul, had no doubt altered the whole character of the countenance.[1] '*Some said, This is he; others said, He is like him;*'[2] these last denying the identity, and allowing only a fortuitous resemblance; and so the debate proceeded, until the man himself cut it short, and '*said, I am he.*' The admission on his part is at once taken up. '*Therefore said they unto him, How were thine eyes opened?*' and having heard from his lips of the wonder-worker who had wrought the cure, and of the means by which He had wrought it, they desire to see Him, and demand where He might be found. The man cannot tell them. In the end, as the safest course, and they possibly having some misgivings about a work thus wrought upon the Sabbath, '*they brought to the Pharisees him that aforetime was blind,*'—not, that is, to the great Sanhedrim, for that was not always sitting, but the lesser. The Sanhedrim, it is true, did not exclusively consist of members of this party (for Caiaphas was a Sadducee, and see Acts xxiii. 6), but these were the most numerous and influential party there, and the bitterest enemies of the Lord.

More formally examined by them, the man can only repeat his simple tale: '*He put clay upon mine eyes, and I washed, and do see.*' Very characteristically he speaks of the clay only, for that only came within the scope of his knowledge, who judged by the feeling alone; *how* the clay had been tempered he was ignorant. Already there is a certain curtness in his reply, reduced as it is to the fewest possible words, as contrasted with the greater particularity of his first explanation (see ver. 11). And now the Pharisees discuss the matter among themselves. Some seek to rob the deed of its significance by a charge against the

[1] Augustine: Aperti oculi vultum mutaverant.

[2] Godet: Les uns reconnaissent franchement le fait; les autres se réservent le moyen de l'éluder.

doer: '*This man is not of God, because He keepeth not the Sabbath day.*' Admitting the reality of the miracle, it proved nothing in favour of Him that wrought it; rather was it to be inferred, since He was thus an evident transgressor of God's commandment, that He was in connexion with the powers of evil. No lighter charge than that which they made at another time, when they said, 'He casteth out devils through the prince of the devils' (Matt. ix. 34), was involved in this word of theirs.

But there was throughout all these events, which were so disastrously fixing the fortunes of the Jewish people, a truer and better party in the Sanhedrim, of which Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea were the worthiest representatives; men like the Poles and Contarinis at another memorable epoch of the Church's history; not in number, perhaps still less in courage, equal to the stemming of the fierce tide of hostility which was rising against the truth,—a tide which probably in the end drew most even of them into its current (cf. John xii. 42, 43); only here and there one and another, such as those above named, extricating himself from it. These from time to time made their voices to be heard in the cause of righteousness and truth. Thus, on the present occasion, they claim that He should not at once be prejudged a sinner and a breaker of God's law, who had done such miracles as these (cf. x. 19–21). Even their own doctors were not altogether at one concerning what was permitted on the Sabbath, and what not; some allowing quite as much as this which Christ had done and more, for only the alleviation of inflammatory or other disorders in the eyes. They could therefore plead that the Spirit of God might well have directed Him in this that He did, and they ask, '*How can a man that is a sinner do such miracles?*' Yet the shape which their interference takes, the form of a question in which it clothes itself, betrays, as Chrysostom has remarked, the timidity of men, who do not dare more than

to hint their convictions; who, to use a phrase but newly come up, 'lack the courage of their opinions.' No wonder that they should be in the end overborne and silenced by their more unscrupulous adversaries, even as now they prove unequal to the obtaining of a fair and impartial hearing of the matter. All which the Evangelist notes for the present is that '*there was a division among them.*'

The interrogation in the verse following, '*What sayest thou of Him, that He hath opened thine eyes?*' has been frequently, but wrongly, understood, not as one question, but as two. The mistake is a very old one, for Theodore of Mopsuestia finds fault with them who divide the question here into two clauses, as thus—'*What sayest thou of Him? That He hath opened thine eyes?*' making the second clause to have its rise in the doubts which the Pharisees felt, or pretended to feel, concerning the reality of the miracle. In truth there is but one question, '*What sayest thou of Him, in that*[1] *He opened thine eyes?* what conclusion drawest thou from thence?' The answer is then to the point, '*he said, He is a prophet*;'[2]—not yet the Messiah, not yet the Son of God; of these higher dignities of his healer the man as yet has no guess; but what he believes Him he boldly declares Him, '*a prophet,*'—one furnished with a message from above, and attesting that message by deeds which no man could do, except God were with him (John iii. 2; iv. 19; vi. 14). They who asked this, cared not in the least for the judgment of the man, expected no oracle from him; but they hoped to mould him into an instrument for their own wicked purposes. Chrysostom indeed, whom others follow, understands this '*What sayest thou of Him?*' as the

[1] Ὅτι = ὑπὲρ ὃν.

[2] Our Version no doubt in general conveys to the English reader the wrong impression. Yet the manner of pointing, with the absence of the second note of interrogation, shows that the Translators had rightly apprehended the passage.

speech of the better-disposed in the Sanhedrim, who hope that the testimony of the man himself may go for something; but this is little probable. The intention of the question is rather that he, perceiving what would be welcome to them, and following the suggestions which they had thrown out, should turn against his benefactor, and ascribe the opening of his eyes to the power of an evil magic. But a rare courage from above is given to him, and he dares, in the face of these formidable men whom he is making his foes, to avouch his belief that the work and the doer of the work were of God.

'*But the Jews did not believe concerning him that he had been blind, and received his sight, until they had called the parents of him that had received his sight.*' To these they address themselves now. There is something selfish, and almost cowardly, in their manner of extricating themselves from a danger in which they are content to leave their son. The questions put to them are three: '*Is this your son?*'—'*Who ye say was born blind?*'—'*How then doth he now see?*' The first two they answer in the affirmative: '*We know that this is our son*'—'*And that he was born blind:*' on the third they altogether decline to give any opinion—'*By what means he now seeth, we know not; or who hath opened his eyes, we know not: he is of age; ask him: he shall speak for himself.*' The parents could not tell the truth without saying something to the honour of Jesus; and they will not do this, fearing to come under the penalties which the Sanhedrim had lately pronounced against any that should '*confess that He was Christ.*' We are not to understand by this that the Sanhedrim had formally declared Jesus to be an impostor, a false Christ,—but only that, so long as the question of the truth or falsehood of his claims to be the Messiah was not yet clear,—and they, the great religious tribunal of the nation, had not given their decision,—none were to anticipate that decision; and any who should thus

run before, or, as it might prove, run counter to, their decision, '*should be put out of the synagogue*,'—that is, should be excommunicated (cf. xii. 42). There were two, or as some say three, kinds of excommunication among the Jews, greatly differing in degrees and intensity; and Christ often speaks of them, as among the sharpest trials which his followers would have to endure for his name's sake (John xvi. 2). The mildest form was exclusion for thirty days from the synagogue. To this period, in case the excommunicated showed no sign of repentance, a similar or a longer period, according to the will of those that imposed the sentence, was added: in other ways too it was made sharper; it was accompanied with a curse; none might hold communion with him now, not even his family, except in cases of absolute necessity. Did the offender show himself obstinate still, he was in the end absolutely separated from the fellowship of the people of God, cut off from the congregation,—a sentence answering, as many suppose, to the delivering to Satan in the apostolic Church[1] (1 Cor. v. 5; 1 Tim. i. 20).

The man had been removed, while his parents were examined. The Pharisees now summon him again, and evidently would have him to believe that they had gotten to the bottom of all; that others had confessed, that for him therefore to stand out any longer in denial was idle, and would only make matters worse in the end. 'Now we know,' they would say, 'that it is all a collusion; we have indubitable proofs of it; do thou also give glory to God, and acknowledge that it is so.' Our '*Give God the praise*' sets the English reader on a wrong track. The Pharisees do not mean, 'Give the glory of thy cure to God, and not

[1] Our Lord is thought to refer to all these three degrees of separation, Luke vi. 22, expressing the lightest by the ἀφορίζειν, the severer by the ὀνειδίζειν, and the severest of all by the ἐκβάλλειν. But it may well be doubtful whether these different grades of excommunication were so accurately distinguished in his time (see Winer, *Realwörterbuch*, s. v. Bann; Vitringa, *De Synagogâ*, p. 738).

to this sinful man, who in truth could have contributed nothing to it,'—attempting, in Hammond's words, 'to draw him from that opinion of Christ which he seemed to have, by bidding him to ascribe the praise of his cure wholly to God, and not to look on Christ with any veneration.' So too Jeremy Taylor: 'The spiteful Pharisees bid him give glory to God, and defy the minister; for God indeed was good, but He wrought that cure by a wicked hand.' But they who did not allow that any cure had taken place at all could not mean this; professing, as they did, to believe that the alleged healing was a fraud and conspiracy throughout, contrived between Christ and the man who was before them. The words are rather an adjuration to him that he should speak the truth[1] (cf. Josh. vii. 19; 1 Sam. vi. 5; 1 Esdr. ix. 8). Hitherto he has been acting as though he could deceive not merely men but God, but now let him honour or '*give glory to God*,' uttering that which is truth before Him, and avouching so his belief in Him as a God of knowledge, of righteousness, and of truth; whom no lie will escape, and who will show Himself a swift witness against all ungodliness of men.[2] '*We know that this man is a sinner*, a more than ordinary transgressor, one, therefore, to whom last and least of all would God have given this higher power; your story then cannot be true; we who have the best opportunities of knowing, know this.' They will overbear him with the authority of their place and station, and with their confident assertion.

[1] The phrase is often an adjuration to repentance in general, which is in the highest sense a taking shame to ourselves, and in that a giving of glory to God (1 Sam. vi. 5; Isai. xlii. 12; Jer. xiii. 16; 1 Esdr. ix. 8; Rev. xi. 13; xvi. 9). Seneca (*Ep.* 95) speaks very nobly of this giving glory to God, as the great work of every man: Primus est Deorum cultus, Deos credere: deinde *reddere illis majestatem suam*, reddere bonitatem, sine quâ nulla majestas est.

[2] Beza: Cogita te coram Deo esse, qui rem totam novit. Reverere igitur ipsius majestatem, et hunc illi honorem habe, ut palam fateri rem totam malis, quam coram eo mentiri.

The man, whom we must recognize throughout as ready-witted, genial, and brave, declines altogether to enter on a question which lay plainly beyond his knowledge: '*Whether He be a sinner or no, I know not*;' yet, as Chrysostom observes, not in the least allowing the alternative that such He was. This is a matter which lies outside of his knowledge; he will speak, however, of that which lies within it; and they may draw their own conclusions: '*One thing I know, that, whereas I was blind, now I see.*' They perceive that they can gain nothing in this way, and they bid him to tell over again the manner and method of his cure: '*Then said they to him again, What did He to thee? how opened He thine eyes?*' hoping either to detect on a second repetition some contradictions in his story, or to find something which they can better lay hold on, and wrest into a charge against the Lord; or perhaps utterly perplexed how to escape from their present embarrassment, they ask for this repetition to gain time, and in the hope that some light may break upon them presently.

But the man has grown weary of the examinations to which they are submitting him anew, and there is something of defiance in his answer: '*I have told you already, and ye did not hear: wherefore would ye hear it again?*'—and then, with an evident irony, '*Will ye also*[1] *be his disciples?*' It is clear that these words cut them to the quick, though it is not so clear what exactly is the taunt conveyed by them. Is it this? 'How idle to tell you over again, when there is that deep-rooted enmity in your hearts against this man, that, though convinced a hundred times, you would yet never acknowledge it, or sit as learners at his feet.[2] Will ye also become his disciples?

[1] In this καὶ ὑμεῖς may lie, as Chrysostom suggests, a confession that *he* was, or intended to be, a follower of this prophet. Bengel: Jucunde observari potest fides apud hunc hominem, dum Pharisæi contradicunt, paullatim exoriens.

[2] Calvin: Significat, quamvis centies convicti fuerint, maligno hostilique affectu sic esse occupatos ut nunquam cessuri sint.

I trow not.' This is the commonest explanation of the words; but does not, however, agree perfectly with their reply. In that they earnestly repel the indignity of being, or intending to be, disciples of his. Such a disclaimer would have been beside the mark, if he, so far from accusing them of any such intention, had on the contrary laid to their charge, that no evidence, no force of truth, could win them to this. More probably then the man, in this last clause of his answer, affects to misunderstand their purpose in asking a repetition of his story: 'Is it then, indeed, that the truth is at length winning you also to its side, so that you too would fain find my story true, and yourselves sit as disciples at this man's feet?' With this the angry rejoinder of the Pharisees will exactly correspond. Nothing could have stung them more than the bare suggestion of such a discipleship on their parts: '*Then they reviled*[1] *him and said, Thou art his disciple*,[2] *but we are Moses' disciples*'—setting, as was their wont, Moses against the Lord, and contrasting their claims: '*we know that God spake unto Moses*;' he had a commission and an authority; but '*as for this fellow, we know not from whence He is*;' all is obscure, uncertain about Him; there is no proof that God has given Him a commission, no one can certainly affirm whether He be from above or from beneath. On a former occasion their charge against Him had been that they knew whence He was (John vii. 27), so impossible is it to convince those who are resolved to remain unconvinced.

This confession that they are at fault, unable to explain so new and wonderful an appearance, still further emboldens the man. They had left a blot, and he, quick-witted with all his simplicity, fails not to take instant advantage

[1] Maledixerunt in the Latin; on which Augustine exclaims: Tale maledictum sit super nos, et super filios nostros—this, and not that which the Jews desired on themselves (Matt. xxvii. 25).

[2] Σὺ εἶ μαθητὴς ἐκείνου. Bengel well: Hoc verbo removent Jesum a sese.

of it. There is an irony keener still in his present retort than in his last: '*Why herein is a marvellous thing, that ye know not from whence He is, and yet He hath opened mine eyes.* This is wonderful; here is one evidently clothed with powers mightier than man's, able to accomplish a work like this; and you, the spiritual rulers of our nation, you that should try the spirits, should be able to pronounce of each new appearance whether it be of God or not, here acknowledge your ignorance, and cannot decide whence He is, whether of earth or of heaven.[1] *Now we know*, for you have yourselves declared the same (see ver. 24), *that God heareth not sinners*; but this man He *hath* heard, and enabled Him to do a work without parallel; therefore I know whence He is; for *if this man were not of God, He could do nothing*—being the same conclusion at which one of themselves had arrived' (John iii. 2).

It is interesting to observe how rapidly this poor man's faith and insight and courage have grown during this very examination. He who had said a little while before, '*Whether He be a sinner or no, I know not*,' evading the answer, now declares boldly, '*We know that God heareth not sinners*.' Nor need we take exception, as many have taken, at his statement, nor urge, as they have thought it needful to do, that this saying has no scriptural authority,[2]

[1] Compare our Lord's question to his adversaries, Matt. xxi. 25: 'The baptism of John *whence was it* (*πόθεν ἦν*)? from heaven or of men?' which best explains the *πόθεν* (= *ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ*, ver. 24) here. In the same way Pilate's question to our Lord, '*Whence* art Thou?' (John xix. 9) is to be explained, 'To what world dost Thou belong?'

[2] Thus Origen (*In Esai. Hom.* v.): Peccatores exaudit Deus. Quod si timetis illud quod in Evangelio dicitur, Scimus quia peccatores non exaudiat Deus, nolite pertimescere, nolite credere. Cæcus erat qui hoc dixit. Magis autem credite ei qui dicit, et non mentitur, Etsi fuerint peccata vestra ut coccinum, ut lanam dealbabo. But elsewhere rightly (*Comm. in Rom.* v. 18): Aliud est peccare, aliud peccatorem esse. Peccator dicitur is, qui multa delinquendo in consuetudinem, et, ut ita dicam, in studium peccandi jam venit. Augustine (*Serm.* cxxxvi.): Si peccatores Deus non exaudit, quam spem habemus? Si peccatores Deus non exaudit, ut quid oramus et testimonium peccati nostri tunsione pectoris dicimus [Luke xviii. 10]? Certe peccatores Deus exaudit. Sed ille qui ista dixit, nondum laverat faciem cordis de Siloâ. In oculis ejus

being the utterance neither of Christ nor of one of his inspired servants, but only of a man not wholly enlightened thus far, in whose mind truth and error were yet struggling. That the words derive no authority from him who uttered them is most true; still they may well be allowed to stand, and that in the intention of the speaker. For the term '*sinner*' has more than one application in Scripture. Sometimes it is applied to all men, as they are the fallen guilty children of Adam. Were it true that in this sense '*God heareth not sinners*,' such were a terrible announcement indeed; nothing short of this, God heareth not any man; or if by '*sinners*' were understood more than ordinary transgressors, and the words implied that such would not be heard, though they truly turned, this too would be an impeaching of God's grace. But the Scripture knows another and emphatic use of the term '*sinners*,'—men *in their sins*, and not desiring to be delivered out of them[1] (Isai. xxxiii. 14; Gal. ii. 15); and in this, which is the

præcesserat sacramentum: sed in corde nondum erat effectum gratiæ beneficium. Quando lavit faciem cordis sui cæcus iste? Quando eum Dominus foras missum a Judæis, intromisit ad se. Cf. *Serm.* cxxxv. 5. Elsewhere (*Con. Lit. Parmen.* ii. 8) he shows that his main desire is to rescue the passage from the abuse of the Donatists. These last, true to their plan of making the sacraments of the Church to rest on the subjective sanctity of those *through* whose hands they passed, and not on the sure promise of Him *from* whose hands they came, misapplied these words. '*God heareth not sinners*;' how then, they asked, can these minister blessings to others? It would be enough to answer that it is not them whom God hears, but the Church which speaks through them; nor did it need, because of this abuse of the words, to except against the statement itself, as smacking of errors from which the man was not yet wholly delivered. Calvin better: Falluntur qui cæcum ex vulgi opinione sic loquutum esse putant. Nam *peccator* hic quoque ut paulo ante impium et sceleratum significat (ver. 24). Est autem hæc perpetua Scripturæ doctrina, quod Deus non exaudiat nisi a quibus vere et sincero corde vocatur. . . . Ideo non male ratiocinatur cæcus, Christum a Deo profectum esse, quem suis votis ita propitium habet.

[1] Thus Augustine (*Enarr. in Ps.* cv. 18): Non est hoc nomen [peccatores] in Scripturis usitatum eorum, qui licet juste ac laudabiliter vivant, non sunt sine peccato. Magis enim, sicut interest inter irridentes et irrisores, inter murmurantes et murmuratores, inter scribentes et scriptores, et cetera similia: ita Scriptura peccatores appellare consuevit valde iniquos, et grandibus peccatorum sarcinis oneratos.

sense of the speaker here, as of the better among the Pharisees, who a little earlier in the day had asked, '*How can a man that is a sinner do such miracles?*' (ver. 16; cf. x. 21), it is most true '*that God heareth not sinners*;' their prayer is an abomination; and even if they ask, they obtain not their petitions[1] (Isai. i. 11–15; lix. 1, 2; Prov. i. 28; xv. 8, 29; xxi. 27; xxviii. 9; Ps. l. 16; lxvi. 18; cix. 7; Job xi. 15; xiii. 16; xxvii. 9; xxxv. 13; Jer. vi. 20; xiv. 12; Amos v. 21–23; Mic. iii. 4; Jam. iv. 3); or only obtain them for their own worse confusion in the end (Num. xxii. 10; Ps. lxxviii. 29-31). '*But if any man be a worshipper of God, and doeth his will, him He heareth*' (Job xi. 13–15; xlii. 8; 1 Tim. ii. 8; 1 John iii. 22; v. 14).

This was what least of all the Pharisees could endure, that the whole relations between themselves and this man should be reversed,—that he should thus be *their* teacher; and while it was now plain that he could neither be cajoled nor terrified from his simple yet bold avowal of the truth, their hatred and scorn break forth without any restraint: '*Thou wast altogether born in sins*,—not imperfect in body only, but, as we now perceive, maimed and deformed in soul also, that birth-sin, which is common to all (Ps. li. 5), assuming far more than a common malignity in thee'—for so much their words imply,—'*and dost thou teach us?*[2] Thou that camest forth from thy mother's womb with the note of thy wickedness upon thee, dost thou school us, presuming to meddle and make in such high matters as these?' They take the same view of his calamity, namely, that it was the note of a more than ordinary guilt, which the disciples had suggested; but make hateful application of it. Characteristically enough they forget that the two charges, one that he had never

[1] The words are so true that Jeremy Taylor has made them the text of three among his noblest sermons, *The return of Prayers, or The conditions of a prevailing Prayer.*

[2] Bengel: Exprobrant de cæcitate pristinâ. Calvin: Perinde illi insultant, ac si ab utero matris cum scelerum suorum notâ prodiisset.

been blind, and so was an impostor,—the other that he bore the mark of God's anger in a blindness which reached back to his birth,—will not agree together, but mutually exclude one another. '*And they cast him out*,'—which does not merely mean, as some explain it (Chrysostom, Maldonatus, Grotius, Tholuck), rudely flung him forth from the hall of judgment, wherever that may have been; but, according to the decree which had gone before, they declared him to have come under those sharp spiritual censures denounced against any that should recognize the prophetic office of the Lord (John vii. 13). Only so would the act have the importance which (ver. 35) is attached to it (cf. John xvi. 2; 3 John 10). No doubt the sign and initial act of this excommunication was the thrusting him forth and separating him from their own company (Acts vii. 58);[1] and so that other explanation has its partial truth.[2] Yet this was not all, or nearly all, involved in the words. This violent putting of him forth from the hall of audience was only the beginning of the things which he should suffer for Christ's sake. Still there was, to use the words of Fuller on this very occasion, this comfort for him, that 'the power of the keys, when abused, doth not shut the door of heaven, but in such cases only shoot the bolt beside the lock, not debarring the innocent person entrance thereat.'

And in him were eminently fulfilled those words, 'Blessed are ye when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their company, and shall reproach you, and cast out your name as evil, for the Son of man's sake' (Luke vi. 22; cf. Isai. lxvi. 5; John xvi. 2). He is cast out from the meaner fellowship, to be received into the higher,—from that which was about to vanish away,

[1] Corn. a Lapide: Utrumque eos fecisse est credibile, scilicet cæcum ex domo, et hoc symbolo ex Ecclesiâ suâ, ejecisse. Ἐκβάλλειν will then have the technical meaning which it afterwards retained in the Church (see Suicer, *Thes.* s. v.).

[2] See Vitringa, *De Synagogâ*, p. 743.

to be admitted into a kingdom not to be moved. The synagogue, so soon to be 'the synagogue of Satan' (Rev. ii. 9), rejects him; the Church of the living God, and Christ, the great κληδοῦχος in that kingdom, receives him; for in him the words of the Psalmist shall be fulfilled, 'When my father and my mother forsake me, the Lord taketh me up' (Ps. xxvii. 12). He has not been ashamed of Christ, and now Christ reveals his true name and his glory unto him; so that he beholds Him no longer as a prophet from God, which was the highest to which hitherto his faith had reached, but as the Son of God Himself. Thus to him that hath is given, and he ascends from faith to faith. '*Jesus heard that they had cast him out*,' and, Himself the Good Shepherd, went in search of this sheep in an hour so favourable as this was for making it his own for ever. '*And when He had found him*,' it may be in the temple (cf. John v. 14), '*He said unto him, Dost thou believe on the Son of God?*' with an emphasis in the original on '*thou*' which it is hard to reproduce in the English: 'Believest *thou* (σύ), while so many others are unbelieving?' The man knows what this title '*Son of God*' means, that it is equivalent to Messiah, but he knows of none with right to claim it for his own: such trust, however, has he in his Healer, that whomsoever He will point out to him as such, he will recognize. '*He answered and said, Who is He, Lord, that I might believe on Him? And Jesus said unto him, Thou hast both seen Him*,[1] *and it is He that talketh with thee*' (cf. John iv. 26). This '*Thou hast seen Him*,' refers to no anterior seeing; for, so far as we know, the man, after his eyes were opened at the pool, had not returned to the Lord, nor enjoyed any opportunity of seeing Him since. It is rather a reply to the

[1] Godet has a fine remark on these words: Les mots *Tu l'as vu*, rappellent expressément le miracle par lequel il a donné à cet homme de pouvoir contempler celui qui lui parle.

question, '*Who is He, Lord, that I might believe on Him?*' 'He is one whom thou hast seen already; thou askest to see Him, but this seeing is not still to do; ever since thou hast been speaking with Me thine eyes have beheld Him, for He is no other than this Son of man that talketh with thee.'[1]

And now the end to which all that went before was but as the prelude, has arrived: '*He said, Lord, I believe; and he worshipped Him:*' not that even now we need suppose him to have known all which that title, '*Son of God,*' contained, nor that, by '*worshipping*' the Lord, he intended to render to Him that supreme adoration, which is indeed due to Christ, but only due to Him because He is one with the Father. For 'God manifest in the flesh' is a mystery far too transcendent for any man to embrace in an instant: the minds even of Apostles themselves could only dilate little by little to receive it. There were, however, in him the preparations for that crowning faith. The seed which should unfold into this perfect flower was securely laid in his heart; and he fell down at the feet of Jesus as of one more than man, with a deep religious reverence and fear and awe. And thus the faith of this poor man was accomplished. Step by step he had advanced, following faithfully the light which was given him; undeterred by opposition which would have been fatal to a weaker faith, and must have been fatal to his, if the good seed had not cast its roots in a soil of more than ordinary depth. But because it was such a soil, therefore when persecution arose, as it did so soon, for the word's sake, he was *not* offended (Matt. xiii. 21); but enduring still, to him at length that highest grace was vouchsafed, to know the only-begotten Son of God, however he may not yet have seen *all* the glorious treasures that were contained in that knowledge. In him was

[1] Corn. a Lapide: *Et vidisti eum,* nunc cum se tibi ipse videndum offert.

grandly fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah, and this at once literally and spiritually: 'In that day the eyes of the blind shall see out of obscurity and out of darkness' (xxix. 18).

So wonderful was the whole event, so had it brought out the spiritual blindness of those who should have been the seers of the nation, so had it ended in the illumination, spiritual as well as bodily, of one who was counted among the blind, that it called forth from the Saviour's lips those remarkable words in which He moralized the whole: '*For judgment I am come into this world, that they which see not might see, and that they which see might be made blind.*' Compare the remarkable words of Isaiah xxix. 17, 18, which are, as it were, a prophecy of all which in this event found its fulfilment. 'I am come,' He would say, 'to reveal every man's innermost state; I, as the highest revelation of God, must bring out men's love and their hatred of what is divine as none other can (John iii. 19–21); I am the touchstone; much that seemed true shall at my touch be proved false, to be merely dross; much that for its little sightliness was nothing accounted of, shall prove true metal. Many, whom men esteemed to be seeing, such as the spiritual chiefs of this nation, shall be shown to be blind; many, whom men counted altogether unenlightened, shall, when my light touches them, be shown to have powers of spiritual vision undreamt of before' (Matt. xi. 25; Luke v. 25; xv. 7). Christ was the King of truth,—and therefore his open setting up of his banner in the world was at once and of necessity a ranging of men in their true ranks, as lovers of truth or lovers of a lie;[1] and He is here saying of Himself the same thing which Simeon had said of Him before: 'Behold this Child is set for the fall and rising again of many in Israel, . . . *that the thoughts*

[1] Augustine (*In Ev. Joh. tract.* xliv.): Dies ille diviserat inter lucem et tenebras.

of many hearts may be revealed' (Luke ii. 34, 35). He is the stone on which men build, the stone against which men stumble,—and set alike for this purpose and for that (1 Pet. ii. 6–8; cf. 2 Cor. ii. 16). These words call out a further contradiction on the part of the Pharisees, and out of this miracle unfolds itself that discourse which reaches down to ver. 21 of the ensuing chapter. They had shown what manner of shepherds of the sheep they were in their exclusion of this one from the fold: 'with force and with cruelty have ye ruled them' (Ezek. xxxiv. 4; which whole chapter may be profitably read in the light of these ninth and tenth chapters of St. John): our Lord proceeds to set over against them Himself, as the good Shepherd and the true.

19. *THE RESTORING OF THE MAN WITH A WITHERED HAND.*

MATT. xii. 9–13; MARK iii. 1–5; LUKE vi. 6–11.

THIS is not the first among our Lord's cures on the Sabbath day[1] which stirs the ill-will of his adversaries, or which is used by them as a pretext for accusing Him. Twice already we have seen the same results follow, the same offence taken; but I have reserved till now the consideration, once for all, of the position which our Lord Himself assumed in respect of the Sabbath, and the light in which He regarded it. For such consideration the present is the most favourable occasion; since here, and in the discourse which immediately precedes this miracle, and which stands, if not quite in such close historic connexion as in St. Matthew's Gospel might at

[1] The sabbatical cures recorded in the Gospels are seven in number, namely, that of the demoniac in the synagogue of Capernaum (Mark i. 21); of Simon's wife's mother (Mark i. 29); of the impotent man at Bethesda (John v. 9); of this man with a withered hand; of the man born blind (John ix. 14); of the woman with a spirit of infirmity (Luke xiii. 14); of the man who had a dropsy (Luke xiv. 1). We have a general intimation of many more, as at Mark i. 34; and the 'one work' to which our Lord alludes, John vii. 21–23, is perhaps no recorded miracle, but one which is only referred to there. On the many miracles which our Lord thought good to effect on this day, we have these remarks by Jeremy Taylor (*Life of Christ*, pt. iii. sect. 14): 'Jesus, that He might draw off and separate Christianity from the yoke of ceremonies by abolishing and taking off the strictest Mosaical rites, chose to do very many of his miracles upon the Sabbath, that He might do the work of abrogation and institution both at once; not much unlike the sabbatical pool in Judæa, which was dry six days, but gushed out in a full stream on the Sabbath; for though upon all days Christ was operative and miraculous, yet many reasons did concur and determine Him to a more frequent working upon those days of public ceremony and convention.'

first sight appear, yet in close inner relation to it, our Lord Himself deals with the question, and delivers the weightiest words which at any time on this matter fell from his lips.

We go back then to that preceding discourse, and to the circumstances which gave rise to it. The Pharisees were offended with the disciples for plucking ears of corn and eating them upon the Sabbath. It was not the act itself, as an invasion of other men's property, which offended, for the very law which they stood forward to vindicate had expressly permitted as much: 'When thou comest into the standing corn of thy neighbour, then thou mayest pluck the ears with thine hand'[1] (Deut. xxiii. 25); by limitations even slight as this upon an absolute proprietorship God asserting that He was Himself the true proprietor of all the land, and that all others held only of Him. Not then in what they did, but in the day on which they did it, the fault of the disciples, if any, lay. The Pharisees accuse them to their Lord: '*Why do they on the Sabbath day that which is not lawful?*' Either He shall be obliged to confess his followers transgressors of the law; or, defending them, shall become a defender of the transgression;—in either case a triumph for his foes. So they calculate, but the issue disappoints their calculation (cf. Matt. xxii. 15–22). The Lord seeks in his reply to raise the objectors to a truer point of view from which to contemplate the act of his disciples; and by two examples, and these drawn from that very law which they believed they were asserting, would show them how the law, if it is not to work mischievously, must be spiritually handled and understood.

These examples are derived, one from the Old-Testament history, the other from that temple-service continu-

[1] See Robinson, *Researches*, vol. ii. p. 192.

ally going on before their eyes. The first, David's claiming and obtaining the shew-bread from the High priest on the occasion of his flight from Saul (1 Sam. xxi. 1–6), might be expected to carry weight with them whom He is seeking to convince, David being for them the great pattern and example of Old-Testament holiness: 'Will ye affirm that they did wrong,—David who in that necessity claimed, or the High priest who gave to him, the holy bread?' The second example came yet nearer home to the gainsayers, and was more cogent still, being no exceptional case, but one grounded in the very constitution of the Levitical service: 'Ye do yourselves practically acknowledge it right that the rest of the Sabbath should give place to a higher interest, to the service of the temple; that, as the lesser, it should be subordinated, and, where needful, offered up to this as the greater. The sacrifices, with all the laborious preparations which they require, do not cease upon the Sabbath (Num. xxviii. 9, 10); all which is needful for completing them is accomplished upon that day; yet no one accounts the priests to be therefore in any true sense violators of the law;[1] such they would rather be if they left these things undone.'[2] And then, lest the Pharisees should retort, or in their hearts make exception, that the work referred to was wrought in the service of the temple, and was therefore permitted, while there was no such serving of higher interests here, He adds, '*But I say unto you, That in this*

[1] Ministerium pellit sabbatum, was a maxim of their own.

[2] He pursues the same argument John vii. 22, 23. 'For the sake of circumcision you do yourselves violate the Sabbath. Rather than not keep Moses' commandment that the child be circumcised on the eighth day, you will, if that eighth be a Sabbath, accomplish all the work of circumcision upon it; and in thus making the Sabbath, which is lower, give place to circumcision, which is higher, you have right. But the cures which I accomplish are greater than circumcision itself. That is but receiving the seal of the covenant upon a single member; my cures are a making the entire man (*ὅλος ἄνθρωπος*) whole. Shall not the Sabbath then by much better right give place to these works of mine?'

place is One greater than the temple;' One whom therefore, by still better right, his servants might serve, and be guiltless.[1] He contemplates his disciples as already the priests of the New Covenant, of which He is Himself the living Temple.[2] It was in their needful service and ministration to Him, which left them no leisure regularly to prepare food or to eat, that they were an hungered, and profaned, as their adversaries esteemed it, the Sabbath. But if those who ministered in that temple which was but the shadow of the true, might without fault accomplish on the Sabbath whatsoever was demanded by that ministry of theirs,—if, as every man's conscience bore witness, they were blameless in such a profanation of the Sabbath as this, and only seemed to transgress the law that really they might keep it, by how much better right were they free from all blame, who ministered about the Temple not made with hands, the true Tabernacle, which the Lord had pitched and not man![3]

But it is not enough to absolve his disciples of any fault in this matter; the malignant accusation must not pass without rebuke; these 'judges of evil thoughts'

[1] Theophylact: Ἀλλὰ λέγεις μοι ὅτι ἐκεῖνοι ἱερεῖς ἦσαν, οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ οὔ· Λέγω οὖν ὅτι τοῦ ἱεροῦ μεῖζόν ἐστι ὧδε. Cocceius: Hoc argumentum urget contra tacitam exceptionem, nempe, discipulos Christi in agro non in templis fecisse opus non sacerdotale. Christus ostendit majorem templo hîc esse, significans se Dominum templi esse, Mal. iii. 1; Jer. xi. 15. Quemadmodum igitur sacerdotes licite fecerunt opera, quæ pertinebant ad cultum Dei ceremonialem; ita discipuli Christi licite fecerunt illa quæ necesse erat facere, ut servirent ipsi vero templo et Domino templi. The argument is not affected by admitting *μεῖζον* instead of *μείζων* into the text, as Lachmann and the best critical editions have done: cf. Matt. xii. 42, *ἰδοὺ πλεῖον Σολομῶντος ὧδε.*

[2] Augustine (*Quæst.* xvii. *in Matth.* qu. 10): Unum exemplum datum *regiæ* potestatis de David, alterum *sacerdotalis* de iis qui per ministerium templi sabbatum violant: ut multo minus ad ipsum evulsarum sabbato spicarum crimen pertineat, qui verus rex et verus sacerdos est, ideo Dominus sabbati.

[3] Irenæus (*Con. Hær.* iv. 8, 3): Per legis verba suos discipulos excusans, et significans licere sacerdotibus libere agere. . . . Sacerdotes autem sunt omnes Domini Apostoli, qui neque agros neque domos hæreditant hîc, sed semper altari et Deo serviunt.

shall themselves be judged. '*But if ye had known what that meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless.*' If with all their searching into the Scripture, all their busy scrutiny of its letter, they had ever so far entered into the spirit of that law whereof they professed to be the jealous guardians and faithful interpreters, as to understand the prophet's meaning here, they would not have blamed them who indeed were blameless. The citation, not now made for the first time (cf. Matt. ix. 13), is from Hosea (vi. 6), and has some ambiguity for an English reader; which would be avoided by such a rendering as this, 'I *desire* mercy, and not sacrifice.'[1] In these memorable words we have one of those prophetic glimpses of the Gospel, one of those slights cast upon the law even during the times of the law, an example of that 'finding fault' on God's part with that very thing which He had Himself established (Heb. viii. 8), whereby a witness was born even for them who lived under the law, that it was only temporary and provisional, God having some better thing in reserve for his people (Ps. l. 7–15; Jer. xxxi. 31–34). The prophet of the Old Covenant is here anticipating the great Apostle of the New, saying in other words, but with as distinct a voice, 'Though I speak with the tongues of men and of Angels, and though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing' (1 Cor. xiii. 1–3). He is declaring that what God longs for on their part who profess to be servants of his, is not the outward observance, the sacrifice in the letter, but the inward outpouring of love, that which the '*sacrifice*' symbolizes, the giving up of self in the self-devotion of love (cf. Heb. x. 5–10; Ps. xl. 6–8; l. 8–14; li. 16, 17; Jer. vii. 22, 23). This must underlie every outward sacrifice and

[1] In the LXX, Ἔλεος θέλω, ἢ θυσίαν, καὶ ἐπίγνωσιν Θεοῦ, ἢ ὁλοκαυτώματα.

service which shall have any value in his sight; and when a question arises between the form and the spirit, so that the one can only be preserved at the expense of the other, then the form must yield to the life, as the meaner to the more precious. In this spirit those have acted, and with a true insight into the law of love, as the highest law of all, who in urgent necessities have sold the most sacred vessels of the Church for the redemption of captives, or for the saving, in a time of famine, of lives which otherwise would have perished.

But the application of the words in the present instance still remains unsettled. They might be taken thus: 'If you had at all known what God desires of men, what service of theirs pleases Him best, you would then have understood that my disciples, who in love and pity for perishing souls had so laboured and toiled as to go without their necessary food, were offering that very thing;[1] you would have seen that their loving violation was better than other men's cold and heartless fulfilment of the letter of the commandment.' Or else the words may refer more directly to the Pharisees: 'If you had understood the service wherein God delights the most, you would have sought to please Him by meekness and by mercy,—by a charitable judgment of your brethren,—by that love out of a pure heart, which to Him is more than all whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices (Mark xii. 33), rather than in the way of harsh, severe, and unrighteous censure of your brethren' (Prov. xvii. 15; Isai. v. 23). So Olshausen:[2] 'This merciful love was just what was wanting in the fault-finding of the Pharisees. It was no true bettering of the disciples which they desired;

[1] Maldonatus: Hoc est quod Apostolos maxime excusabat, quod in prædicando et faciendis miraculis adeo fuissent occupati, ut nec parare cibum nec capere possent.

[2] So Wolf (*Curæ*, in loc.): Non dubitaverim verba hæc opponi judicio Pharisæorum immiti et rigido, de discipulis tanquam violatoribus sabbati rato.

no pure zeal for the cause of God urged them on. Rather sought they out of envy and an inner bitterness to bring something against the disciples; and, in fact, out of this did, in an apparent zeal for the Lord, persecute the Lord in his disciples. They "*condemned the guiltless*;" for the disciples had not out of *ennui*, for mere pastime's sake, plucked those ears, but out of hunger (ver. 1). Their own they had forsaken, and they hungered now in their labour for the kingdom of God. They stood therefore in the same position as David the servant of God, who, in like manner, with them that were with him, hungered in the service of the Lord; as the priests, who in the temple must labour on the Sabbath, and so for the Lord's sake seem to break the law of the Lord. While this was so, *they* also might without scruple eat of the shew-bread of the Lord: what was God's, was also theirs.'

St. Mark has alone preserved for us the important words which follow: '*The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath.*' The end for which the Sabbath was ordained was that it might bless man; the end for which man was created was not that he might observe the Sabbath. A principle is here laid down, which must extend to the whole circle of outward ordinances. The law was made for man; not man for the law. Man is the end, and the ordinances of the law the means; not these the end, and man the means (cf. 2 Macc. v. 19; a remarkable parallel). Man was not created to the end that he might observe these; but these were given, that they might profit man, discipline and train him, till he should be ready to serve God from the free impulses of his spirit.[1] And all this being so, '*therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath.*' To affirm with Grotius, that '*Son of man*' has no deeper meaning here than '*man*'

[1] Even in the Talmud it was said, 'The Sabbath is in your hands, not you in the hands of the Sabbath; for it is written, The Lord hath *given you* the Sabbath, Exod. xvi. 29; Ezek. xx. 12.'

in the verse preceding (thus Ezek. ii. 1 ; iii. 1 ; iv. 1 ; v. 1 ; vi. 2, and often), that the context gives no room for any other interpretation, and from this to conclude that the Sabbath being '*made for man*,' man therefore can deal with the Sabbath as he will, is a serious error.[1] For, in the first place, in no single passage of the New Testament where 'Son of man' occurs (and they are eighty-eight in all) does it mean other than the Messiah, *the* Man in whom the idea of humanity was altogether fulfilled. And then secondly, among all the bold words with which St. Paul declares man's relations to the law, he never speaks of him, even after he is risen with Christ, as being its '*lord*.' The redeemed man is not, indeed, *under* the law; he is released from his bondage to it, so that it is henceforth *with him*, as a friendly companion, not *over him*, as an imperious master.[2] But for all this it is God's law, the expression of his holy will concerning man ; and he, so long as he bears about a body of sin and death, and therefore may at any moment need its restraints, never stands *above* it; rather, at the first moment of his falling away from the liberty of a service in Christ, will come *under* it anew. Even of the ceremonial law man is not lord, that he may loose *himself* from it, on the plea of insight into the deeper mysteries which it shadows forth. He must wait a loosing from it at those hands from which it first proceeded, and which first imposed it upon him. But the '*Son of man*,' who is also Son of God, has power over all these outward ordinances. It was He who first gave them as a preparatory discipline for the training of man; and when they have

[1] Cocceius answers well: Non sequitur: Hominis causâ factum est sabbatum : Ergo homo est dominus sabbati. Sed bene sequitur : Ergo is, cujus est homo, et qui propter hominem venit in mundum, quique omnem potestatem in cælo et terrâ possidet, in hominis salutem et bonum est et Dominus sabbati. Ceterum Dominus sabbati non esset, nisi esset supremus *νομοθέτης*, et nisi ad ipsius gloriam pertineret sabbati institutio, et ejus usus ad salutem hominis.

[2] He is not, to use Augustine's fine distinction, *sub* lege, but *cum* lege and *in* lege.

done their work, when this preparatory discipline is accomplished, it is for Him to remove them (Heb. ix. 11–15). 'Made *under* the law' in his human nature (Gal. iv. 4), He is *above* the law, and lord of the law, by right of that higher nature which is joined with his human. *He* therefore may pronounce *when* the shadow shall give place to the substance, *when* his people have so made one their own that they may forego the other. Christ is 'the end of the law,' and that in more ways than one. To Him it pointed; in Him it is swallowed up; being Himself living law; yet not therefore in any true sense the destroyer of the law, as the adversaries charged Him with being, but its transformer and glorifier, changing it from a bondage to a liberty, from a shadow to a substance, from a letter to a spirit[1] (Matt. v. 17, 18).

To this our Lord's clearing of his disciples, or rather of Himself in his disciples (for it was at Him that the shafts of their malice were indeed aimed), the healing of the man with a withered hand is by St. Matthew immediately attached, although from St. Luke we learn that it was on '*another Sabbath*' that it actually found place. Like the very similar healing of the woman with a spirit of infirmity (Luke xiii. 11), like that of the demoniac at Capernaum (Mark i. 23), it was wrought in a synagogue. There, in '*their synagogue*,' the synagogue of those with whom He had thus disputed, He encountered '*a man who had his hand withered*;' his '*right hand*,' as St. Luke tells us (cf. xxii. 50). His disease, which probably extended through the arm, had its origin in a deficient absorption of nutriment; was a partial atrophy, showing itself in a gradual wasting of the bulk of the limb, with a loss of its powers

[1] Augustine (*Serm.* cxxxvi. 3): Dominus sabbatum solvebat: sed non ideo reus. Quid est quod dixi, sabbatum solvebat? Lux ipse venerat, umbras removebat. Sabbatum enim a Domino Deo præceptum est, ab ipso Christo præceptum, qui cum Patre erat, quando lex illa dabatur: ab ipso præceptum est, sed in umbrâ futuri.

of motion, and ending with the total cessation in it of all vital action. When once thoroughly established, it is incurable by any art of man.[1]

The apparent variation in the different records of this miracle, that in St. Matthew the question proceeds from the Pharisees, in the other Gospels from the Lord, is no real one; the reconciliation of the two accounts is easy. The Pharisees first ask Him, '*Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath days?*' He answers question with question, as was so often his custom (see Matt. xxi. 24): '*I will ask you one thing. Is it lawful on the Sabbath days to do good, or to do evil? to save life or to destroy it?*' With the same infinite wisdom which we admire in his answer to the lawyer's question, 'Who is my neighbour?' (Luke x. 29), He shifts the whole argument, lifts it up altogether into a higher region; and then at once it is evident on which side the right lies. They had put the alternative of doing or not doing; there might be a question here. But He shows that the alternative is, the doing good or the failing to do good,—which last He puts as identical with doing evil, the neglecting to save as equivalent to destroying (Prov. xxiv. 11, 12). Here there could be no question; this under no circumstances could be right; it could never be good to sin. Therefore it is not merely allowable, but a duty, to do some things on the Sabbath.[2] 'Yea,' He

[1] See Winer, *Realwörterbuch*, s. v. *Krankheiten*. In the apocryphal *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, in use among the Nazarenes and Ebionites, which was probably our St. Matthew, with some extraneous additions, this man is a mason, who thus pleads for his own healing: Cæmentarius eram, manibus victum quæritans: precor te, Jesu, ut mihi restituas sanitatem, ne turpiter mendicem cibos. The χεῖρα ἔχων ξηράν is = τὴν χεῖρα ἀδρανὴς ὤν of Philostratus (*Vita Apollon.* iii. 30), whom the Indian sages heal.

[2] Danzius (in Meuschen, *Nov. Test. ex Talm. illustr.* p. 585): Immutat ergo beneficus Servator omnem controversiæ statum, ac longe eundem rectius, quam fraudis isti artifices, proponit. In his interesting and learned Essay, *Christi Curatio Sabbathica vindicata ex legibus Judaicis*, Danzius seeks to prove by extracts from their own books that the Jews were not at all so strict, as now, when they would accuse the Lord, they

goes on, 'and works much less important and urgent than that which I am about to do, you would not yourselves leave undone. *What man shall there be among you, that shall have one sheep, and if it fall into a pit on the Sabbath day, will he not lay hold on it, and lift it out? How much then is a man better than a sheep?* You have asked Me, Is it lawful *to heal* on the Sabbath? I reply, It is lawful *to do well* on that day, and therefore to heal.' '*They held their peace,*' having nothing to answer more.

'*Then,*'—that is, '*when He had looked round about on them with anger, being grieved for the hardness of their hearts* (Mark iii. 5),—*saith He to the man, Stretch forth thy hand.*' The presence of grief and anger in the same heart at the same time is no contradiction. Indeed, with Him who was at once perfect love and perfect holiness, grief for the sinner must ever go hand in hand with anger against the sin; and this anger, which with us is in danger of becoming a turbid thing, of passing into anger against the man, who is God's creature, instead of being anger against the sin, which is the devil's corruption of God's creature,—with Him was perfectly pure; for it is not the agitation of the waters, but the sediment at the bottom, which troubles and defiles them; and where no sediment is, no impurity will follow on their agitation. This important notice of the anger with which the Lord looked round on these evil men we owe to St. Mark, who has so often preserved for us a record of the passing lights and shadows which swept over the countenance of the Lord (vii. 34; x. 21). The man obeyed the word, which was a word of

professed to be, in their own observance of the Sabbath. He finds proof of this (p. 607) in the words, '*Thou hypocrite,*' addressed on one such occasion to the ruler of the synagogue (Luke xiii. 15). It is hard to judge how far he has made out his point, without knowing how far the extracts in proof, confessedly from works of a later, often a far later, date fairly represent the earlier Jewish canons. In the apocryphal gospels (see Thilo, *Codex Apocryphus*, pp. 502, 558), it is very observable how prominent a place among the charges brought against Christ on his trial are the healings wrought upon the Sabbath.

power; '*he stretched it forth, and it was restored*[1] *whole, like as the other.*'

Hereupon the exasperation of Christ's enemies rises to the highest pitch. He has broken their traditions; He has put them to silence and to shame before all the people. '*They were filled with madness,*' as St. Luke tells us; or, in the words of St. Matthew, '*went out, and held a council against Him, how they might destroy Him*' (cf. John xi. 53). In their blind hate they snatch at the nearest weapon in their reach; do not even shrink from joining league with the Herodians, the Romanizing party in the land,—attached to Herod Antipas, the ruler of Galilee, who was only kept on his throne by the support of Rome,—if between them they may bring to nothing this new power which equally menaces both. So, on a later occasion (Matt. xxii. 16), the same parties are leagued together to ensnare Him. For thus it is ever with the sinful world. Its factions, divided against one another, can yet lay aside for the moment their mutual jealousies and enmities, to join in a common conspiracy against the truth. The kingdom of lies is no longer a kingdom divided against itself, when the kingdom of the truth is to be opposed. Between lie and lie, however seemingly antagonistic, there are always points of contact, so that they can act together for a while; it is only between a lie and the truth that there is absolute opposition, and no compromise possible. Herod and Pilate can be friends together, if not always, yet for the destroying of the Christ (Luke xxiii. 12). The Lord, aware of the machinations of his enemies, withdraws from their malice to his safer retirements in the immediate neighbourhood of the sea of Galilee (Mark iii. 7; John xi. 53, 54).

[1] Ἀποκατεστάθη. Josephus (*Antt.* viii. 8. 5) uses the very noticeable word ἀναζωπυρεῖν (cf. 2 Tim. i. 6) in relating the restoration of Jeroboam's withered arm (1 Kin. xiii. 6).

20. *THE RESTORING OF THE WOMAN WITH A SPIRIT OF INFIRMITY.*

LUKE xiii. 10–17.

WE have here another of those cures, which, as having been accomplished on the Sabbath, awoke the indignation of the rulers of the Jewish Church; cures, of which some, though not all, are recorded chiefly for the sake of showing how the Lord dealt with these cavillers; and what He Himself contemplated as the true hallowing of that day. This being the main point which the Evangelist has in his eye, everything else falls into the background. We are not told where this healing took place; but only that '*He was teaching in one of the synagogues on the Sabbath.*' While there was but one temple in the land, and indeed for all Jews in all the world,—for that on Mount Gerizim and that in Egypt were alike impostures (John iv. 22), shells without a kernel, fanes empty of all presence of God,—there were synagogues in every place; and in these, on every Sabbath, prayer was wont to be made, and the Scriptures of the Old Testament read and expounded (Luke iv. 16, 17; Acts xiii. 14, 15; xv. 21). We have another miracle performed in a synagogue, Mark i. 23. But now to deal with this one. '*And, behold, there was a woman which had a spirit of infirmity eighteen years, and was bowed together, and could in no wise lift up herself.*' Had we only this account of what ailed her, namely that she '*had a spirit of infirmity,*' we might doubt whether St. Luke meant to trace up her complaint to any other than the natural causes, whence flow the

weaknesses and sufferings which afflict our race. But the Lord's later commentary on these words,—'*whom Satan hath bound*,'—shows that her calamity had a deeper spiritual root; though the type of her possession was infinitely milder than that of many others, as is plain from her permitted presence at the public worship of God. Her sickness having its first seat in her spirit, had brought her into a moody melancholic state, of which the outward contraction of the muscles of her body, the inability to lift herself, was but the sign and the consequence.[1]

'*And when Jesus saw her, He called her to Him, and said unto her, Woman, thou art loosed from thine infirmity*,'—not waiting till his aid was sought (cf. John v. 6), though possibly her presence may have been, on her part, a tacit seeking of that aid. As much seems implied in the words of the ruler of the synagogue, bidding the multitude

[1] This woman is often regarded as representing all those whom the poet addresses—Oh curvæ in terras animæ!—the erect countenance of man, in contrast with that bent downward of all other creatures, being the sign impressed upon his outward frame, of his nobler destiny, of a heavenly hope, with which they have nothing in common:

> Os homini sublime dedit, cælumque tueri
> Jussit, et erectos in sidera tollere vultus:

and Juvenal, *Sat.* xv. 142–147, in a nobler strain: cf. Plato, *Timæus*, 90 A.; and the derivation by some of *ἄνθρωπος*, as the *upward-looking*. On the other hand, the looks ever bent upon the ground are a natural symbol of a heart and soul turned earthward altogether, and wholly forgetful of man's true good, which is not beneath, but above, him. Thus of Mammon Milton writes:

> 'Mammon, the least erected spirit that fell
> From heaven; for even in heaven his looks and thoughts
> Were always downward bent.'

Thus Augustine (*Enarr.* ii. *in Ps.* lxviii. 24): Qui bene audit, Sursum cor, curvum dorsum non habet. Erectâ quippe staturâ exspectat spem repositam sibi in cælo. . . . At vero qui futuræ vitæ spem non intelligunt, jam excæcati, de inferioribus cogitant: et hoc est habere dorsum curvum, a quo morbo Dominus mulierem illam liberavit. Cf. *Enarr. in Ps.* xxxvii. 7; *Quæst. Evang.* ii. qu. 29; Ambrose, *Hexaëm.* iii. 12; Theophylact (in loc.): *Ταῦτα δέ μοι λάμβανε τὰ θαύματα καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἐντὸς ἄνθρωπον· συγκύπτει γὰρ ψυχὴ ὅταν ἐπὶ τὰς γηΐνας μόνας φροντίδας νεύῃ, καὶ μηδὲν οὐράνιον ἢ θεῖον φαντάζηται.*

upon other days than the Sabbath to '*come and be healed.*' '*And He laid his hands on her,*'[1]—this act of power, no doubt, accompanying those words of power; and from Him there streamed into her the currents of a new life, so that the bands, spiritual and bodily, by which she was holden, were loosened; '*and immediately she was made straight, and glorified God*' (Luke xvii. 15; xviii. 43); others, no doubt, of those present glorifying God with her (Matt. ix. 8; xv. 31). Some part of this glory could not but redound to Him who was the immediate author of her cure. But there was one who could ill endure to be a witness of this (cf. Matt. xxi. 15, 16). That day of gladness, when, as these tokens evidently declared, God had visited his people, and raised up a great prophet among them, and given such power to men, was a day of angry displeasure to him. He, '*the ruler of the synagogue,*' interrupting, and so far as in him lay, marring that festival of joy, '*answered with indignation,*[2] *because that Jesus had healed on the Sabbath day, and said unto the people, There are six days in which men ought to work: in them therefore come and be healed, and not on the Sabbath day.*' Not venturing to come into direct collision with the Lord, he seeks circuitously and covertly to reach Him through the people, who were more submitted to pharisaic influence, and whom he feared less. He takes advantage of his position as interpreter of the oracles of God; and from 'Moses' seat' would fain persuade them that this work done to the glory of God—this undoing of the heavy burden—this unloosing the chains of Satan, the very work for which the Messiah came (1 John iii. 8),[3]—was a servile work, and one there-

[1] Chrysostom (in Cramer, *Catena*): Προσεπιτίθησι δὲ καὶ χεῖρας αὐτῇ, ἵνα μάθωμεν ὅτι τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγον [Λόγου?] δύναμίν τε καὶ ἐνέργειαν ἡ ἁγία πεφόρηκε σάρξ.

[2] Augustine (*Enarr.* ii. *in Ps.* lxviii. 24): Bene scandalizati sunt de illâ erectâ, ipsi curvi. And again (*Serm.* cccxcii. 1): Calumniabantur autem erigenti, qui, nisi curvi?

[3] The λύειν here is but as a visible embodiment of the λύειν spoken of there.

fore forbidden on the Sabbath. Rebuking them for coming to be healed, he indeed has another in his eye, and means that rebuke to glance off on Him, who upon this day had been willing to be a Healer.

The Lord takes him up with unusual severity. '*Thou hypocrite!*' He calls him—zeal for God being only the cloak which he wore, to hide from others, or perhaps in a more hopeless hypocrisy still, from himself as well, his hatred to all which was holy and divine. And this his hypocrisy Christ proceeds to lay bare to him, making him to feel that, however he might plead to himself or to others the violation of the Sabbath as the cause of his indignation, its real ground lay in the fact that Christ was glorified by the cure upon that day wrought. The Lord proceeds: '*Doth not each one of you on the Sabbath loose his ox or his ass from the stall, and lead him away to watering? And ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound, lo, these eighteen years, be loosed from this bond on the Sabbath day?*' Every word of this answer *tells*. He does not so much defend his breach of the Sabbath, as deny that He has broken it at all:[1] 'You have your relaxations of the Sabbath's strictness, required by the very nature and necessities of your earthly condition; you make no difficulty in the matter, where, through work left undone on the Sabbath, loss would ensue to you in your earthly possessions. Your ox and your ass are precious in your sight, and, whatever you may hold or teach concerning the strictness with which the Sabbath should be kept, disciples of Hillel or disciples of Schammai, you loose them on that day; yet are angry now that I should loose a human spirit, which as such is of more value than many beasts. And

[1] Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* iv. 30): Unusquisque vestrûm sabbatis non solvit asinum aut bovem suum a præsepi et ducit ad potum? Ergo secundum conditionem legis operatus, legem confirmavit, non dissolvit, jubentem nullum opus fieri, nisi quod fieret omni animæ, quanto potius humanæ. Cf. Irenæus, *Con. Hær.* iv. 8.

these animals, when you loose them, have not been tied up for more than a few hours; while I, in your thoughts, may not loose from the thraldom of Satan this captive of eighteen years.[1] Yours too is a laborious process of unfastening and leading away to water,—which yet (and rightly) you do not omit; being for all this offended with Me, who have but spoken a word, and with that word have released a soul.'[2] There lies at the root of this argument, as of so much else in Scripture, an implied assertion of the specific difference between man, the lord of creation, for whom everything else was made, on the one side, and all the inferior creatures which inhabit the same earth with him, and to which upon the side of his body he is akin, on the other. He is, and at the same time is much more than, the first link in this chain and order of beings (cf. 1 Cor. ix. 9: 'Doth God take care of oxen?' Ps. viii. 8; Luke xii. 6, 7). But besides the common claims of humanity, this woman had other and still stronger claims to this help from Him. She was a '*daughter of Abraham*;' compare Luke xix. 9—an inheritress, as perhaps the Lord would imply, of the faith of Abraham,—however, for the saving of her soul in the day of the Lord, she had come under the scourge of Satan and this long and sore affliction of the flesh; member at all events she was of that elect family which had the first right to all the benefits and blessings, spiritual and temporal, by Him brought into the world (Matt. xv. 26; Rom. iii. 1, 2; xi. 1). The narrow-hearted Scribe might grudge to behold her a partaker of this grace; but in his eyes it was only meet that

[1] Ambrose (*Exp. in Luc.* vii. 175): Vinculum vinculo comparat. . . . . Cum ipsi animalibus sabbato solvunt vincula, reprehendunt Dominum, qui homines a peccatorum vinculis liberavit.

[2] Chemnitz (*Harm. Evang.* 112): Tempus etiam inter se confert. Jumenta fortassis ad noctem unam aut paucos dies præsepi alligantur. At vero hæc femina vel saltem ob temporis prolixitatem omnium commiseratione dignissima est.

she should receive it. So and with such words as these He puts to silence the malice of ignorant men.[1]

[1] In a Sermon on the Day of the Nativity (*Serm. Inedd.* p. 33) Augustine makes the following application of this history: Inclinavit se, cum sublimis esset, ut nos qui incurvati eramus, erigeret. Incurvata siquidem erat humana natura ante adventum Domini, peccatorum onere depressa; et quidem se in peccati vitium spontaneâ voluntate curvaverat, sed sponte se erigere non valebat. . . . Hæc autem mulier formam incurvationis totius humani generis præferebat. In hâc muliere hodie natus Dominus noster vinculis Satanæ alligatos absolvit, et licentiam nobis tribuit ad superna conspicere, ut qui olim constituti in miseriis tristes ambulabamus, hodie venientem ad nos medicum suscipientes, nimirum gaudeamus.

21. *THE HEALING OF THE MAN WITH A DROPSY.*

LUKE xiv. 1–6.

ALL which is most remarkable in the circumstances of this miracle has been already anticipated in others, chiefly in the two just considered, to which the reader is referred. Our Lord in his great long-suffering did not even at this late period of his ministry treat the Pharisees as wholly and finally hardened against the truth. So far from this, and still seeking to win them for his kingdom, He had accepted the invitation of a chief among them '*to eat bread*' in his house. This was upon the Sabbath, with the Jews a favourite day for their festal entertainments: for it is an entire mistake to regard the day with them as one of rigorous austerity; on the contrary, the practical abuse of the day was rather a turning of it into a day of riot and excess.[1] The invitation, though accepted in love, yet had not been given in good faith; in the hope rather that the close and more accurate watching of his words and ways, which such an opportunity would afford, might furnish matter of accusation against Him.[2] Mischief lurked in the apparent courtesy which was shown Him, nor could the sacred laws of hospitality defend Him from

[1] On the abuses in this kind of the Jewish Sabbath at a later day see Chrysostom, *De Lazaro Hom.* I; Augustine, *Enarr.* ii. *in Ps.* xxxii. 2; *Enarr. in Ps.* xci. 1; *Serm.* ix. 3. Compare Plutarch (*Symp.* iv. 6): *Ὅταν σάββατον τιμῶσιν* [οἱ Ἑβραῖοι], *μάλιστα μὲν πίνειν καὶ οἰνοῦσθαι παρακαλοῦνται ἀλλήλους.*

[2] The emphasis, however, which Hammond finds in the *καὶ αὐτοί*, *even* they that had invited Him treacherously watched Him, is questionable. Such a superabounding *καὶ* is frequent in St. Luke (ii. 21).

the ever-wakeful malice of his foes. They '*watched Him.*'[1]

'*And behold, there was a certain man before Him which had the dropsy.*' Some have suggested that this sufferer was of design placed before Him. But although it is quite conceivable of these malignant adversaries, that they should have laid such a snare as this, still there is no ground for ascribing to them such treachery here; and the difficulty which some find, that apart from such plot, the man would scarcely have found his way into the house of the Pharisee, rests upon a forgetfulness of the almost public life of the East, not to say how easily in a moment of high excitement, such as this of our Saviour's presence must have been, the feeble barriers which the conventional rules of society might oppose to his entrance would have been overborne (Luke vii. 36, 37). At any rate, if such plot there was, the man himself was no party to it; for the Lord '*took him, and healed him, and let him go.*'

But before He did this, He justified the work which He would accomplish, as more than once He had justified similar works of grace and love wrought upon the Sabbath, demanding of these lawyers and Pharisees, interpreters of the law, '*Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath day?*' Here, as in so many matters of debate, it only needs for the question to be rightly stated, and all is so clear, that the question itself, as capable of receiving more answers than one, has for ever disappeared;[2] there can only be one answer. But as this answer they would not give, they did what alone was possible, '*they held their peace*;' for they would not assent, and they could not gainsay. He pro-

[1] Ἦσαν παρατηρούμενοι. For a similar use of παρατηρεῖν compare vi. 7; xx. 20; Mark iii. 2; Dan. vi. 11.

[2] Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* iv. 12): Adimplevit enim et hic Legem, dum conditionem interpretatur ejus, dum operum differentiam illuminat, dum facit quæ lex de sabbati feriis excipit, dum ipsum sabbati diem, benedictione Patris a primordio sanctum, benefactione suâ efficit sanctiorem, in quo scilicet divina præsidia ministrabat.

ceeds: '*Which of you shall have an ass*[1] *or an ox fallen into a pit, and will not straightway pull him out on the Sabbath day?*' Olshausen: 'As on other occasions (Matt. xii. 11; Luke xiii. 15), the Lord brings back those present to their own experience, and lets them feel the keen contradiction in which their blame of Christ's free work of love sets them with themselves, in that, where their worldly interests were at hazard, they did that very thing whereof they made now an occasion against Him.' As in that other case, where the woman was *bound*, He adduces the example of *unbinding* a beast (Luke xiii. 15), so in this, where the man was dropsical, a sufferer from water, the example He adduces has an equal fitness.[2] 'You grudge that I should deliver this man on such a day from the water that is choking him; yet if the same danger from water threatened aught of your own, you would make no scruple about extricating that on the Sabbath. Why then do you not love your neighbour as yourselves? why do you grudge that *he* should receive the help which you would freely render to your own?' '*And they could not answer Him again to these things.*' They were silenced, but not convinced; and the truth, which did not win them, did the only other thing which it could do, exasperated them the more; they replied nothing, biding their time (cf. Matt. xii. 14).

[1] Strange as the reading *υἱός* instead of *ὄνος* appears, '*a son*,' and not '*an ass*,' the authorities for it are so overwhelming (including *all* the Uncial MSS.), that one has no right on the ground of internal difficulties to reject it. Neither are these so serious as at first sight they seem. It is true the argument a minori ad majus is thus invalidated, but another is substituted in its room; an appeal, namely, to the great ethical rule, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour *as thyself*.' Griesbach recommended *υἱός*; Scholz, Tischendorf, Lachmann all adopt it. Exod. xxi. 33, to which the favourers of *ὄνος* appeal, tells both ways. It may support the reading *ὄνος*, but it may also have suggested it.

[2] So Augustine (*Quæst. Evang.* ii. 29): Congruenter hydropicum animali quod cecidit in puteum, comparavit: humore enim laborabat; sicut et illam mulierem quam decem et octo annis alligatam dixerat . . . comparavit jumento quod solvitur ut ad aquam ducatur. Grotius: Hydropicum submergendæ pecudi, ut *τὴν συγκύπτουσαν* pecudi vinctæ comparavit.

22. *THE CLEANSING OF TEN LEPERS.*

LUKE xvii. 11–19.

THE Jews who dwelt in Galilee, in their obligatory journeys to keep the passover at Jerusalem, very commonly took the longer route, leading them across the Jordan, and through the region of Peræa (the Gilead of the Old Testament), so to avoid the vexations and annoyances, or the worse insults and outrages,[1] to which they were exposed in passing through the inhospitable land of the Samaritans. For these, at all times unfriendly to Jews, were naturally most unfriendly of all to the pilgrims who, travelling up to the great feasts at Jerusalem, thus witnessed in act against the will-worship of Mount Gerizim, and against the temple of Samaria in which was no presence of the living God (John iv. 22). It is generally understood that at this time, notwithstanding the discomforts and dangers of that inhospitable route (see Luke ix. 51–56; John iv. 9), our Lord, with the band of his disciples, on this his last journey to the holy city, took the more direct and shorter way which led Him straight from Galilee '*through the midst of Samaria*' to Jerusalem. Certainly the words which we have translated, '*And it came to pass, as He went to Jerusalem, that He passed through the midst of Samaria and Galilee*,' *may* bear this meaning; in our Version they must bear it. At the same time some understand the Evangelist to say that the Lord passed *between these two*

[1] Josephus (*Antt.* xx. 6. 1) relates the massacre by the Samaritans of a great number of Galilæan pilgrims, which happened a little later than this.

regions,[1] having one on his right hand, the other on his left, and skirting them both. This would explain the mention, otherwise unaccountable, of Samaria *before* Galilee. He will then have journeyed due eastward toward Jordan, having Galilee on his left hand, and Samaria, which is therefore first named, on his right: and on reaching the river, must either have passed over it at Scythopolis, where we know there was a bridge, recrossing it by the fords near Jericho[2] (Josh. ii. 7), or continued on the western bank till He reached that city, where presently we find Him (Luke xviii. 36).

'*And as He entered into a certain village, there met Him ten men that were lepers, which stood afar off.*' Their common misery had drawn these poor outcasts together (cf. 2 Kin. vii. 3). It had done more. It had caused them to forget the fierce national antipathy which kept Jew and Samaritan apart; for a Samaritan, as presently appears, had found admission into this forlorn company. It is not unlikely that in this border land such a fellowship may have proved easier than elsewhere. There has been already occasion to speak of the nature of leprosy, and of the meaning of the Levitical ordinances about it. It was the outward symbol of sin in its worst malignity, as involving therefore entire separation from God; not of spiritual sickness only, but of spiritual death, since absolute separation from the one fountain of life must needs be no less. These poor outcasts, in obedience to the commandment (Lev. xiii. 46; Num. v. 2; cf. 2 Kin. xv. 5), '*stood afar off*;' and out of a deep sense of their misery, yet not without hope that a Healer was at hand, and all of them in earnest now to extort the benefit, however at a

[1] Such a '*between*' appears as a marginal alternative in the R.V.

[2] So Wetstein: Non viâ rectâ et brevissimâ septentrione versus meridiem per Samaritican regionem iter fecit, sed cum confinia Samariæ et Galilææ venisset, ab itinere deflexit versus orientem, ita ut Samariam ad dextram, Galilæam ad sinistram haberet; et Jordanem Scythopoli, ubi pons erat, videtur transiisse, et juxta ripam Jordanis in Peræâ descendisse, donec e regione Jerichuntis iterum trajiceret.

later period some were remiss in giving thanks for it, '*lifted up their voices, and said, Jesus, Master, have mercy on us!*' All who have studied this terrible disease tell us that an almost total failure of voice is one of the symptoms which accompany it. It is not then for nothing that we are presently told of one who had been restored to health that he returned *with a loud voice* glorifying God; while here the earnestness with which on the part of all the boon was sought, is sufficiently indicated by the fact that they '*lifted up their voices*,' found such an utterance as it might have seemed beforehand the disease would have denied them.

'*And when He saw them, He said unto them, Go, show yourselves unto the priests.*' Most instructive is it to observe the differences in our Lord's dealing with the different sufferers and mourners brought in contact with Him; the *manifold* wisdom of the great Physician, varying his treatment according to the varying needs of his patients; how He seems to resist a strong faith, that He may make it stronger yet (Matt. xv. 23–26); how He goes to meet a weak faith, lest it should prove altogether too weak in the trial (Mark v. 56); how one He forgives first, and heals after (Matt. ix. 2, 6); and another, whose heart could only be reached through an earthly benefit, He first heals, and only then forgives (John v. 8, 14). There are here, too, no doubt reasons why these ten are dismissed as yet uncleansed, and bidden to show themselves to the priests; whilst that other, whose healing was before recorded (Matt. viii. 2–4), is first cleansed, and not till afterwards bidden to present himself in the temple. These reasons I think we can perceive. There was here, in the first place, a keener trial of faith. With no signs of restoration as yet upon them, they were bidden to do that which implied that they were perfectly restored,—to undertake a journey, which would prove ridiculous, a labour altogether in vain, unless Christ's word and promise

proved true. In their prompt obedience they declared plainly that some weak beginnings of faith were working in them: the germs of a higher faith, which yet in the end was only perfectly unfolded in one.[1] So much they declared, for they must have known very well that they were not sent to the priests for these to heal them. That was no part of the priest's office; who did not cure, but only pronounce cured; who cleansed, yet not as ridding the leper of his disease, but only as authoritatively proclaiming that this had disappeared, and restoring him, through certain ceremonial observances, to the fellowship of the congregation (Lev. xiv. 3, 4).

Then, too, as there was a keener trial of faith than that to which the leper of Matt. viii. 2 was exposed, so also there was here a stronger temptation to ingratitude. '*It came to pass, that as they went, they were cleansed.*' When these poor men first felt and found the benefit whereof they were partakers, it is little likely that they were still in the immediate presence of their benefactor; more probably, already out of his sight, and some way upon their journey.[2] It was not therefore an easy and costless effort to return and render thanks to Him. At all events it was an effort greater than the most of them cared to make: '*one of them, when he saw that he was healed, turned back, and with a loud voice glorified God,*[3] *and fell down at*

[1] Calvin: Quamvis enim fœtidam adhuc scabiem in carne suâ conspiciant, simul tamen ac jussi sunt se ostendere sacerdotibus, parere non detrectant. Adde quod nunquam, nisi fidei impulsu, profecti essent ad sacerdotes: ridiculum enim fuisset, ad testandam suam munditiem, lepræ judicibus se offerre, nisi pluris illis fuisset Christi promissio, quam præsens morbi sui intuitus. Visibilem in carne suâ lepram gestant, unico tamen Christi verbo confisi mundos se profiteri non dubitant: negari igitur non potest eorum cordibus insitum fuisse aliquod fidei semen. . . . Quo magis timendum est, ne et nobis contingat scintillas fidei in nobis micantes extinguere.

[2] Calvin suggests another reason, which may have kept them away: Ut morbi memoriam extinguerent furtim elapsi sunt.

[3] We learn from Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* iv. 35) that the Gnostic Marcion saw in this healing of the lepers by the way, this taking of the

his feet, giving Him thanks: and he was a Samaritan.' Some, indeed, suppose that the return of this one did not take place till after he had fulfilled all which was commanded him; that he had been to the priests—that he had offered his gift—that he had been pronounced clean—and, this his primary duty accomplished, that he then returned to render thanks to the author of his healing; the sacred narrative leaping over large spaces of time and many intermediate events for the purpose of bringing together the beginning and the end of this history.[1] But certainly the record of the miracle which we have here seems to me to leave no room for such an interpretation. It was '*when he saw that he was healed*'—the words are to my mind decisive, and not when he had fulfilled all which was enjoined him—that he turned back. He, as I take it, and his whole company, having advanced some way on their commanded journey, became aware of the grace which had overtaken them; they felt and knew themselves cleansed. Hereupon this Samaritan, from whom it could least have been expected, turned back in the fulness of a grateful heart to give glory to God and thanks to his great Healer and Saviour; like the Syrian Naaman, who, delivered from the same hideous disease, returned with all his company, beseeching the man of God to take a blessing at his hands (2 Kin. v. 15); the others meanwhile

work out of the hands of the Levitical priests, a contempt cast by the Lord on the Mosaic institutions: Hic Christum æmulum [legis] affirmat prævenientem solennia legis etiam in curatione decem leprosorum, quos tantummodo ire jussos ut se ostenderent sacerdotibus, in itinere purgavit, sine tactu jam et sine verbo, tacitâ potestate, et solâ voluntate; and again, Quasi legis illusor, ut in itinere curatis ostenderet nihil esse legem cum ipsis sacerdotibus. There was no such passing of them by, since the priests' work was not to cleanse, but to pronounce clean.

[1] Calvin halts between this opinion and that which follows: Mihi tamen magis probabile est, non nisi audito sacerdotis judicio ad gratias agendas venisse. . . . Nisi forte magis placet diversa conjectura, simul ac mundatum se vidit, antequam testimonium expeteret a sacerdotibus, ad ipsum auctorem pio et sancto ardore correptum venisse, ut sacrificium suum a gratiarum actione inciperet.

enduring to carry away the benefit without one grateful acknowledgment rendered unto Him from whom it came, and into whose presence a very little labour would have brought them. To sin their sin is only too easy; for, as one has well said, with allusion to their mighty crying which went a little before, 'We open our mouths wide till God open his hand; but after, as if the filling of our mouths were the stopping of our throats, so are we speechless and heartless.'[1] Of all graces thankfulness, whether as displaying itself toward God or toward men, is perhaps the rarest.

Even He, who 'knew what was in man,' who had already so often proved the ingratitude of men, marvelled at the greatness of the ingratitude of these: for He asked, '*Were there not ten cleansed?*' or rather, '*Were not the ten cleansed? but where are the nine? There are not found that returned to give glory to God, save this stranger.*' Him now He dismisses with a second blessing, and one better than the first. That earlier had reached but to the healing of his body, and he had that in common with the unthankful nine; but gratitude for a lower mercy obtains for him a higher, a blessing which is singularly his, and reaches not merely to the springs of bodily health, but to the healing of the very sources of his spiritual life. That which the others missed,[2] to which their bodily healing should have introduced them, and would so have done, if they had received it aright, he has obtained; for to him,

[1] So too Bernard: Importuni ut accipiant, inquieti donec acceperint, ubi acceperint ingrati. Calvin: Sic inopia et esuries fidem gignit, quam occidit saturitas.

[2] Bernard (*In Cant. Serm.* 51): Ingratitudo veluti ventus urens est, siccans sibi fontem pietatis, rorem misericordiæ, fluenta gratiæ. And he draws the lesson for us: Disce in referendo gratiam non esse tardus aut segnis, disce ad singula dona gratias agere. Diligenter, inquit, considera quæ tibi opponantur [Prov. xxiii. 1], ut nulla videlicet Dei dona debitâ gratiarum actione frustrentur, non grandia, non mediocria, non pusilla. Denique jubemur colligere fragmenta ne pereant, id est nec minima beneficia oblivisci. Numquid non perit quod donatur ingrato?

and to him only, it is said, '*Arise*'—for he was kneeling still—'*go thy way; thy faith hath made thee whole*'[1] (Luke vii. 50; Matt. ix. 22; Mark x. 52).

It gives a special significance to this miracle, and explains its place in that Gospel which is eminently the Gospel for the heathen, that this thankful one should have been a Samaritan, a stranger therefore by birth to the covenants of promise, while the nine unthankful were of the seed of Abraham. It was involved in this that the Gentiles (for this Samaritan was no better)[2] were not excluded from the kingdom of God; nay rather, might obtain a place in it before others who by nature and birth were children of the kingdom; that the ingratitude of these might exclude them, while the faith of those might give to them an abundant entrance into all its blessings.

How aptly does the image which this history supplies set forth the condition of the faithful in this world! They too are to take Christ's word that they will be cleansed, that in some sort they are so already (John xv. 3); for in baptism they have the pledge and promise and the initial act of it all. And this they must believe, even while they

[1] Calvin: *Servandi* verbum quidam interpretes ad carnis munditiem restringunt; verum si ita est, quum vivam in hoc Samaritano fidem commendet Christus, quæri potest quomodo servati fuerint alii novem; nam eadem promiscue omnibus sanitas obtigit. Sic ergo habendum est Christum hîc aliter æstimâsse donum Dei quam soleant profani homines, nempe tanquam salutare paterni amoris symbolum vel pignus. Sanati fuerunt novem leprosi, sed quia Dei gratiam impie obliterant, ipsam sanitatem inficit et contaminat eorum ingratitudo, ut quam decebat utilitatem ex eâ non percipiant. Sola igitur fides dona Dei nobis sanctificat, ut pura sint, et cum legitimo usu conjuncta in salutem nobis cedant. . . . Servatus est suâ fide Samaritanus. Quomodo? certe non ideo tantum, quod a leprâ curatus sit (nam hoc et reliquis commune erat), sed quia in numerum filiorum Dei acceptus est, ut paterni amoris tesseram ex ejus manu acciperet. Godet: Par ce retour, il a scellé pour toujours le lien préalable et passager que sa guérison avait formé entre Jésus et lui; il s'unit étroitement à toute la personne de celui dont il n'avait d'abord recherché que la puissance. Et par là sa guérison physique est transformée en guérison morale, en salut.

[2] Ἀλλογενής our Lord expressly calls him; and see my *Notes on the Parables*, 14th ed. pp. 316 sqq.

still feel in themselves the leprous taint of sin,—must go forward in faith, being confident that in the use of his Word and his sacraments, and all his appointed means of grace, slight as they may seem to meet and overcome such mighty mischiefs, they will find that health which according to the sure word of promise is in some sort already theirs; and as they go, believing this word, using these means, they *are* healed. And for them, too, a warning is here—that they forget not the purging of their old sins (2 Pet. i. 9)—nor what those sins were, how ugly, how loathsome; after the manner of those nine, who perhaps did not return, as desiring to obliterate the very memory of all which once and so lately they had been. Let those who now are clean through the word spoken to them, keep ever in memory the times of their past anguish,—the times when everything seemed defiled to them, and they to everything; when they saw themselves as 'unclean, unclean,' shut out from all holy fellowship of God and men, and cried out in their anguish, '*Jesus, Master, have mercy upon us.*' Let them see to it, that they forget not all this; but let each remembrance of the absolving word which was spoken to them, with each new consciousness of a realized deliverance from the power and pollution of sin, bring them anew to the Saviour's feet, giving glory to God by Him; lest, failing in this, their guilt prove greater than even that of these unthankful nine. For these carried away temporal mercies unacknowledged; but we should in such an event be seeking to carry away spiritual; not, indeed, that we should succeed in so doing; since the spiritual mercy which is not evermore referred to its Author, sooner or later inevitably ceases from him who thinks on any other conditions to retain it.[1]

[1] Chemnitz (*Harm. Evang.* 125): Remittit nos Filius Dei ad ministerium Verbi et Sacramentorum in Ecclesiâ; et quemadmodum hi sanati sunt dum iverunt, et mandato Christi obtemperârunt, ita et nos dum in Ecclesiâ Verbum Dei audimus, absolutione et Sacramentis utimur, vult

nobis Christus peccata remittere, nos sanare, ut in cælesti Jerusalem mundi coram Deo compareamus. . . . Omnes nati sumus filii iræ, in baptismo remittitur nobis ille reatus, sed non statim in cælos abripimur: verum dicit nobis, Ite, ostendite vos sacerdotibus. Leve quid ut videtur injungit. Utut autem leve sit, sequitur tamen enarrabile bonum, quia is qui nobis hoc præcipit, est omnipotens Deus, qui ex minimis maxima producere potest. Cf. Augustine, *Quæst. Evang.* ii. 40.

23. *THE HEALING OF THE DAUGHTER OF THE SYROPHŒNICIAN WOMAN.*

MATT. xv. 21–28; MARK vii. 24–30.

WE have no reason to think that at any time during his earthly ministry our Lord passed beyond the borders of the Holy Land; not even when He '*departed into the coasts of Tyre and Sidon.*' It was only '*into the borders of Tyre and Sidon,*' as St. Mark expressly tells us (vii. 24), that He went; and even St. Matthew's words need not, and certainly here do not, mean more than that He approached the confines of that heathen land.[1] The general fitness of things, and more than this, his own express words on this very occasion, '*I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel,*' combine to make it most unlikely that He had now brought his healing presence to any other but the people of the Covenant; and, moreover, when St. Matthew speaks of the '*woman of Canaan*' as *coming out* of that district or '*of the same coasts,*' he clearly shows that he did not intend to describe the Lord as having more than drawn close to the skirts of that profane land.

Being there, He '*entered into an house, and would have no man know it: but,*' as 'the ointment bewrayeth itself,' so He, whose 'Name is like ointment poured out,' on the present occasion '*could not be hid*;' and among those attracted by its sweetness was a woman of that country,—'*a*

[1] Kuinoel here: In partes Palæstinæ regioni Tyriorum et Sidoniorum finitimas. So Exod. xvi. 35: εἰς μέρος τῆς Φοινίκης (LXX), 'to the borders of Canaan.' Chrysostom, Theophylact, and others understand an actual passing over on the Lord's part into a heathen land.

woman of Canaan,' as St. Matthew terms her; '*a Greek, a Syrophœnician,*' as St. Mark has it,[1] by the first term indicating her religion, that it was not Jewish, but heathen; by the second, the stock of which she came, being no other than that accursed race once doomed of God to excision root and branch (Deut. vii. 2), but of which some branches had been spared by those first generations of Israel that should have destroyed all (Judg. ii. 2, 3). Everything, therefore, seemed banded against her; yet this everything did not prevent her from drawing nigh, from seeking, and as we shall presently see from obtaining, the boon that her soul longed after. She had heard of the mighty works which the Saviour of Israel had done; for already his fame had gone through all Syria; so that 'they brought unto Him all sick persons that were taken with divers diseases and torments, and those which were possessed with devils, and those which were lunatic, and He healed them' (Matt. iv. 24). And she has a boon to ask for her daughter;—or say rather for herself, so entirely has she made her daughter's misery her own: '*Have mercy on me, O Lord, Thou Son of David; my daughter is grievously vexed with a devil*;' just as on a later occasion the father of the lunatic child exclaims, 'Have compassion on *us*, and help *us*' (Mark ix. 22).[2]

But she finds Him at a first encounter very different from that gracious helper and healer which report had described Him to her. He, who of Himself had anticipated the needs of others (John v. 6), withdrew Himself from hers; '*He answered her not a word.*' 'The Word has no

[1] Συροφοινίκισσα, Lachmann; Σύρα Φοινίκισσα, Tischendorf; and between these readings the best MSS. are divided. Συροφοίνισσα is very weakly attested: it is indeed the more Greek form, yet not therefore here to be preferred, but rather the contrary. See a learned note by Grotius, on Matt. xv. 22. This woman's name, according to the *Clementine Homilies* (ii. 19), was Justa, where legends of her later life, and her passage from heathenism to Judaism, are to be found. The daughter's name, Bernice, is known as well.

[2] Bengel: Suam fecerat pia mater miseriam filiæ.

word; the fountain is sealed; the physician withholds his remedies' (Chrysostom); until at last the disciples, wearied out with her persistent entreaties, and to all appearance more merciful than their Lord, themselves '*came and besought Him, saying, Send her away.*' They reveal at the same time the root of selfishness out of which this compassion of theirs grew; for why is He to satisfy her and dismiss her? '*for she crieth after us*;' she is making a scene; she is drawing on them unwelcome observation. Theirs is that heartless granting of a request, with which most of us are only too well acquainted; when it is granted out of no true pity for the suppliant, but to leave undisturbed his selfish ease from whom at length it is extorted, —a granting such as his who gave, but gave saying 'lest by her continual coming she weary me' (Luke xviii. 5). Here, as so often, behind a seeming severity lurks the real love, while under the show and semblance of a greater easiness selfishness lies hid.

These intercessors meet with no fairer acceptance than the suppliant herself; and Christ stops their mouth with words which seem to set the seal of hopelessness on her suit: '*He answered and said, I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel*' (cf. Matt. x. 5, 6). In what sense was this true? All prophecy which went before declared that in Him, the promised seed, not one nation only, but all nations of the earth, should be blest (Ps. lxxii. 11; Luke ii. 32; Rom. xv. 9–12). He Himself declared, 'Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice' (John x. 16). It has happened before now with the founders of false religions that, as success beckoned them on, the circle of their vision has widened; and they who meant no more at the outset than to give a faith to their tribe or nation, have aspired at last to give one to the world. But here all must have been always known; the world-embracing reach of his mission, and of the faith which He should found, was con-

templated by Christ from the beginning (Matt. xiii. 31–33). In what sense then, and under what limitations, could He say with truth, '*I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel*'? Clearly it must have been in his own personal ministry.[1] That ministry, for wise purposes in the counsels of God, should be restricted to his own nation; and every departure from this, the prevailing rule of his whole earthly activity, was, and was clearly marked as, an exception. Here and there, indeed, there were preludes of the larger mercy which was in store,[2] first drops of that gracious shower which should one day water the whole earth (John xii. 20–22). Before, however, the Gentiles should glorify God for his mercy, He must first be 'a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers' (Rom. xv. 8, 9). It was only as by a rebound from them that the grace was to light upon the heathen world; while yet that issue, which seemed thus accidental, was laid deep in the counsels of God (Acts xiii. 44–49; xix. 9, 10; xxviii. 25–28; Rom. xi.). In Christ's reply, as St. Mark gives it, '*Let the children first be filled,*' the refusal does not appear so absolute and final, and a glimpse is vouchsafed of the manner in which the blessing might yet pass on to others, when as many of these, '*the children,*' as were willing, should have accepted it. But there, too, the *present* repulse is absolute. The time is not yet; others intermeddle not with the meal, till the children have had enough.

[1] Augustine (*Serm.* lxxvii. 2): Hîc verborum istorum oritur quæstio: Unde nos ad ovile Christi de gentibus venimus, si non est missus nisi ad oves quæ perierunt domûs Israel? . Quid sibi vult hujus secreti tam alta dispensatio, ut cum Dominus sciret quare veniret, utique ut Ecclesiam haberet in omnibus gentibus, non se missum dixerit, nisi ad oves quæ perierunt domûs Israel? Intelligimus ergo præsentiam corporis sui, nativitatem suam, exhibitionem miraculorum, virtutemque resurrectionis in illo populo eum ostendere debuisse. Jerome (*Comm. in Matt.* in loc.): Perfectam salutem gentium passionis et resurrectionis tempori reservabat.

[2] Calvin: Præludia quædam dare voluit communis misericordiæ.

The woman hears the repulse which the disciples who had ventured to plead for her receive; but is not daunted or disheartened thereby. Hitherto she had been crying after the Lord, and at a distance; but now, instead of being put still farther from Him, '*came she and worshipped Him, saying, Lord, help me.*' On this He breaks the silence which hitherto He has maintained towards her; but it is with an answer more discomfortable than that silence itself had been: '*He answered and said, It is not meet to take the children's bread,*[1] *and to cast it to dogs.*' '*The children*' are, of course, the Jews, 'the children of the kingdom' (cf. Matt. viii. 12). He who spoke so sharply *to* them, speaks thus honourably *of* them; nor is there any contradiction in this: for here He is speaking of the position which God has given them in his kingdom; there, of the manner in which they have realized that position. On the other hand, extreme contempt was involved in the title of '*dog*'[2] given to any one, the nobler characteristics of this animal, although by no means unknown to antiquity,[3] being never brought out in Scripture (Deut. xxiii. 18; Job xxx. 1; 1 Sam. xvii. 43; xxiv. 14; 2 Sam. iii. 8; ix. 8; xvi. 9; 2 Kin. viii. 13; Prov. xxvi. 11; Ps. xxii. 16; Isai.

[1] Maldonatus: Habent canes panem suum minus delicatum, quam filii; res naturales, Sol, Luna, pluvia, et cetera idem genus canum, id est Gentilium, panis sunt; quæ providentiâ quidem Dei, sed generali minusque accuratâ dispensantur, et omnibus in commune, sicut porcis glandes, projiciuntur: Evangelica gratia, quæ supra naturam est, panis est filiorum non projiciendus temere, sed majore consilio rationeque distribuendus.

[2] Many, as Maldonatus, find a further aggravation of the contempt in the κυναρίοις (catellis, Vulg.), not even dogs, but whelps. But Olshausen, more justly, that in the diminutive lies a slight mitigation of the exceeding severity of the repulse; though the author of an article in the *Theol. Stud. und Krit.* 1870, p. 135, on this miracle, pushes this view further and builds more upon it than the facts will warrant. Calvin brings out well the force of the βαλεῖν: *Projiciendi* verbo utitur significando non bene locari, quod Ecclesiæ Dei ablatum profanis, hominibus vulgatur. Clarius exprimitur consilium Christi apud Marcum vii. 27, ubi habetur, Sine prius saturari filios. Nam Cananæam admonet præpostere facere, quæ velut in mediâ cœnâ in mensam involat.

[3] Homer, *Odyssey*, xvii. 291; Æschylus, *Agamemnon*, 618.

lxvi. 3; Matt. vii. 6; Phil. iii. 2; 2 Pet. ii. 22; Rev. xxii. 15).

There are very few for whom this would not have been enough; few who, even if they had persevered thus far, would not now at length have turned away in anger or despair. Not so, however, this heathen woman; she, like the Roman centurion (Matt. viii. 8), and under circumstances infinitely more trying than his, is mighty in faith; and from the very word which seems to make most against her, draws with the ready wit of faith an argument in her own behalf. She entangles the Lord, Himself most willing to be so entangled, in his own speech; she takes the sword out of his own hand, with which to overcome Him:[1] '*Truth, Lord: yet the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their masters' table.*' Upon these words Luther, who has dwelt on all the circumstances of this little history with a peculiar love, and is never weary of extolling the mighty faith of this poor heathen, exclaims, 'Was not that a master-stroke? she snares Christ in his own words.' And oftentimes he sets this Canaanitish woman before troubled and fainting hearts, that they may learn from her how to wring a Yea from God's Nay; or, rather, learn how to hear the deep-hidden Yea, which many times lurks under his seeming Nay. 'Like her, thou must give God right in all He says against thee, and yet must not stand off from praying, till thou overcomest as she overcame, till thou hast turned the very charges made against thee into arguments and proofs of thy need, till thou too hast taken Christ in his own words.'

The rendering of her answer in our Version is not, however, altogether satisfactory. For, indeed, she accepts the Lord's declaration, not immediately to make exception against the conclusion which He draws from it, but to show how *in that very declaration* is involved the granting

[1] Corn. a Lapide: Christum suis verbis irretit, comprehendit, et capit. Rationem contra se factam in ipsum leniter retorquet.

of her petition.[1] 'Saidest Thou *dogs*? it is well; I accept the title and the place; for the dogs *have* a portion too; —not indeed the first, not the children's portion, but a portion still,—the crumbs which fall from the masters' table. In this very putting of the case, Thou bringest us heathen, Thou bringest *me*, within the circle of the blessings which God, the great Householder, is ever dispensing to his family. We also belong to his household, though we occupy but the lowest place therein.[2] According to thine own showing, I am not wholly an alien, and therefore I will abide by this name, and will claim all which in it is included.' By the '*masters*' she does not intend the Jews, which is the mistake of Chrysostom and many more;[3] for thus the whole image would be deranged

[1] There is nothing adversative in καὶ γάρ = etenim (see Passow), to justify the '*yet*' of our Version, or the 'nevertheless' of Tyndale's. Wiclif, Cranmer, and the Rhemish Version have the right translation; so too the Geneva: 'Truth, Lord, *for indeed* the whelps eat of the crumbs;' as the Vulgate: Etiam, Domine, *nam et* catelli edunt. So De Wette: Ja, Herr! denn es essen ja die Hunde. Maldonatus, always acute, and with merits as an interpreter, which, setting apart his bitter polemical spirit, deserve the highest recognition, has exactly caught the meaning here: Hoc est quod volo, me esse canem, *nam et* catelli comedunt de micis quæ cadunt de mensâ dominorum suorum.—The '*crumbs*' are more than the accidental offal from the table: it was common at meals to use, instead of a napkin, the softer parts of the bread (ἀπομαγδαλία), which were afterwards thrown to the dogs; Eustathius: Εἰς ὃ τὰς χεῖρας ἀποματτόμενοι, εἶτα κυσὶν ἔβαλλον (see Becker, *Charicles*, vol. i. p. 431).

[2] Tauler, on these words (*Homil.* p. 162): Felices nimium vereque beatos, qui hoc pacto ad ipsissimum veritatis fundum pertingere possent, ita ut nec Dominus Deus nec creaturæ omnes tantum eos dejicere, vilipendere, et deprimere possent, quam ipsi in veritate sese multo amplius intra se absque fictione dejicerent, vilipenderent, deprimerentque; nec tantum eis vel Deus vel creaturæ denegare, aut adeo eos repellere et dejicere valerent, quin semper stabiles perseverarent, plenâque cum fiduciâ magis ac magis Deo propinquare niterentur; et studium denique atque conatum suum non solum non remitterent, sed intenderent etiam et augerent, instar feminæ hujus, cu quamvis dure Dominus loqueretur, ipsa tamen minime cessit, nec quidquam fiduciæ illius deposuit, quam erga divinam gerebat gratiam; ideoque tandem quod voluit adepta est, et quicquid postulârat a Domino plenissime obtinuit.

[3] So Ludolphus (*Vita Jesu Christi*, pars 1ª, c. 89): Vide mulieris patientiam et humilitatem. Deus enim vocat Judæos filios, et illa dominos; nec doluit de inimicorum laudibus, nec de suo molestata est convitio.

and disturbed—they are '*the children*'—but the great Heavenly householder Himself. She uses the plural, '*masters*,' to correspond with the plural, '*dogs*,' which Christ had used just before; compare 'sons' to correspond with 'kings' at Matt. xvii. 26; while yet it is the one Son only, the Only-begotten of the Father, who is intended there.[1] He who fills all things living with plenteousness spreads a table for all flesh; and all that depend on Him are satisfied from it, each in his own order and place, the children at the table, and the dogs beneath it. There lies in her statement something like the Prodigal's petition, 'Make me as one of thy hired servants,'—a recognition of diverse relations, some closer, some more distant, in which divers persons may stand to God,—yet all blest, who, whether in a nearer or a remoter station, receive their portion from Him.

She has conquered at last. She, who before heard only those words of a seeming contempt, now hears words of a most gracious commendation,—words such as are addressed but to one other in all the Gospel history: '*O woman, great is thy faith!*' He who showed at first as though He would have denied her the smallest boon, now opens to her the full treasure-house of his grace, and bids her to help herself, to carry away what she will: '*Be it unto thee even as thou wilt.*'[2] He had shown to her for a while, as Joseph showed to his brethren, the aspect of

[1] Maldonatus: Loquitur pluraliter propter canes, quorum suum quisque dominum habet.

[2] Luther (*Enarr. in Gen.* xxxii. 27): Fuit profecto pulcherrima et præclara fides, et insigne exemplum quod monstrat rationem et artificium luctandi cum Deo. Non enim ad primum ictum abjicere statim animum et omnem spem debemus, sed instandum, orandum, quærendum, pulsandum est. Et ut maxime fugam meditetur, tamen tu ne cessa, sed sectare sedulo perinde ut mulier Cananæa faciebat, quam non poterat latere Christus, sed intravit, inquit Marcus (vii. 25), in domum, et procidit ad pedes ejus. Si enim in domo se abdit in cubiculum, nec vult cuiquam patefieri aditum, ne recedas tamen, sed sequere. Si non vult audire, pulsa fores cubiculi, obstrepe. Id enim est summum sacrificium, non cessare orando et quærendo, donec vincamus ipsum.

severity; but, like Joseph, He could not maintain it long; —or rather He would not maintain it an instant longer than was needful, and after that word of hers, that mighty word of an undaunted faith, it was needful no more: '*For this saying go thy way; the devil is gone out of thy daughter.*'

Like the centurion at Capernaum (Matt. viii. 13), like the nobleman at Cana (John iv. 53), she made proof that his word was as effectual spoken far off as near. She offered in her faith a channel of communication between her distant child and Christ. With one hand of that faith she laid hold on Him in whom all healing grace was stored, with the other on her suffering daughter,—herself a living conductor by which the power of Christ might run, like an electric flash, from Him to the object of her love. '*And when she was come to her house, she found the devil gone out, and her daughter laid upon the bed,*' weak and exhausted, as these words imply, from the paroxysms of the spirit's going out;—unless, indeed, they indicate that she was now taking that quiet rest, which hitherto her condition had excluded. It will then answer to the 'clothed and in his right mind' (Luke viii. 35) of another who had been similarly tormented.

The question remains, *Why* this anguish was not spared her, *why* the Lord should have presented Himself under so different an aspect to her, and to most other suppliants? Sometimes He anticipated their needs, 'Wilt thou be made whole?' (John v. 6); or if not so, He who was waiting to be gracious needed not to be twice asked for his blessings. Why was it that in this case, to use the words of an old divine, Christ 'stayed long, wrestling with her faith, and shaking and trying whether it were fast-rooted' or no? Doubtless because He saw in it a faith which would stand the proof, knew that she would emerge victorious from this sore trial; and not only so, but with a mightier and purer faith than if she had borne away her blessing at

once and merely for the asking. Now she has learned, as then she never could have learned, 'that men ought always to pray, and not to faint;' that when God delays a boon, He does not therefore deny it. She has learned the lesson which Moses must have learned, when 'the Lord met him, and sought to kill him' (Exod. iv. 24); she has won the strength which Jacob won from his wrestling, till the day broke, with the Angel. There is, indeed, a remarkable resemblance between this history and that of Jacob (Gen. xxxii. 24–32). There, as here, we note the same persevering struggle on the one side, the same persevering refusal on the other; there, as here, the stronger is at last overcome by the weaker. God Himself yields to the might of faith and prayer; for a later prophet, interpreting that mysterious struggle, tells us the weapons which the patriarch wielded: 'he wept and made supplication unto Him,' connecting with this the fact that 'he had power over the Angel, and prevailed' (Hos. xii. 3, 4). The two histories, indeed, only stand out in their full resemblance, when we keep in mind that the Angel there, the Angel of the Covenant, was no other than that Word, who, now incarnate,[1] 'blest' this woman at length; as He had blest at length Jacob at Peniel,—in each case so rewarding a faith which had said, 'I will not let Thee go, except Thou bless me.'

Yet, when we thus speak of man overcoming God, we must never for an instant lose sight of this, that the power whereby he overcomes the resistance of God, is itself a power supplied *by* God. All that is man's is the faith, or the emptiness of self, with the hunger after God, which enables him to appropriate and make so largely his own the fulness and power of God; so that here also that word comes true, 'Blessed are the poor in spirit; for

[1] This has been doubted by some; but see the younger Vitringa, *Diss. de Luctâ Jacobi*, p. 18, seq., in his *Diss. Sac.*; and Deyling, *Obss. Sac.* p. 827, seq.

theirs is the kingdom of heaven.' Thus when St. Paul speaks of himself under an image which rested originally on Jacob's struggle, if there was not a direct allusion to it in the Apostle's mind, as *striving* for the Colossians (Col. i. 29), striving,[1] that is, with God in prayer (see iv. 12), he immediately adds, 'according to *his* working, which worketh in me mightily.'

We may observe, in conclusion, that we have three ascending degrees of faith, as it manifests itself in the breaking through hindrances which would keep from Christ; in the paralytic (Mark ii. 4); in the blind man at Jericho (Mark x. 48); and in this woman of Canaan. The paralytic broke through the outward hindrances, the obstacles of things merely external; blind Bartimæus through the hindrances opposed by his fellow-men; but this woman, most heroical of all, through apparent hindrances even from Christ Himself. These, in all their seeming weakness, were yet as three mighty ones, not of David, but of David's Son and Lord, who forced their way through opposing hosts, until they could draw living water from wells of salvation (2 Sam. xxiii. 16).

[1] Ἀγωνιζόμενος: cf. Col. ii. 1, where Grotius says rightly, Per ἀγῶνα intelligit non sollicitudinem tantum, sed preces assiduas.

24. *THE HEALING OF ONE DEAF AND DUMB.*

MARK vii. 31–37.

ST. MATTHEW tells us in general terms that when the Lord had returned from those coasts of Tyre and Sidon unto the sea of Galilee, 'great multitudes came unto Him, having with them those that were lame, blind, dumb, maimed,[1] and many others, and cast them down at Jesus' feet, and He healed them' (xv. 30). Out of this number of cures St. Mark selects one to relate more in detail, and this, no doubt, because it was signalized by some incidents which had not occurred on any other like occasion. '*They bring unto Him one that was deaf, and had an impediment in his speech,*' one who, if not wholly dumb, was yet incapable of uttering articulate sounds.[2] His case

[1] Κυλλός, properly, crippled or maimed *in the hand,* as Jerome (in loc.) observes: Quomodo claudus dicitur, qui uno claudicat pede, sic κυλλός appellatur, qui unam manum debilem habet. Nos proprietatem hujus verbi non habemus. *We* also have no one equivalent word. It is the Italian monco as distinguished from manco. At Matt. xviii. 8 it is evidently '*maimed* of the hand,' but does not here mean so much; for though, of course, it lay in Christ's power to supply a lost limb, yet we nowhere meet a miracle of this kind, neither should we expect to meet such; for He was come now, a Redeemer, that is a setter free of man in his body and in his soul from alien powers which held him in bondage—but not a Creator. Even in his miracles which approach nearest to creation, He ever assumes a substratum on which to work. It is no limitation of this divine power of Christ, to suppose that it had thus a law according to which it wrought, and beyond which it did not extend; for this law is only the law of infinite fitness which it received from itself.

[2] Some make μογιλάλος here mute, chiefly on account of the ἀλάλους of ver. 37; and refer to Isai. xxxv. 6 (LXX), τρανὴ δὲ ἔσται γλῶσσα μογιλάλων, in proof; as also to Exod. iv. 11, where, though not the Septuagint, yet the three other Greek translations use this word in the sense of dumb. At the same time the ἐλάλει ὀρθῶς of ver. 35 favours

differs, apparently, from that of the dumb man mentioned Matt. ix. 32; for while that man's evil is traced up distinctly and directly to a spiritual source, nothing of the kind is intimated here, nor are we, as Theophylact suggests, to presume such. Him his friends now brought to the great Healer, '*and they beseech Him to put his hand upon him.*' It was a frequent petition on the part of those who sought help from the Lord for their sick that He would lay hands upon them; thus see Matt. ix. 18; but we do not find Him always complying with the request; sometimes, however, He chooses this as his method of healing (Mark vi. 5; viii. 23, 25; Luke iv. 40; xiii. 13). It is not, however, exactly in the way they designate that He will heal him who is brought to Him now.

It has been already observed, that there must lie a deep meaning in all the variations which mark the different healings of different sick and afflicted, a wisdom of God ordering all the circumstances of each particular cure. Were we acquainted as accurately as He who 'knew what was in man,' with the spiritual condition of each who was brought within the inner circle of his grace, we should then perfectly understand why one was healed in the crowd, another led out of the city before the work of restoration was commenced; why for one a word effected a cure, for another a touch, while a third was sent to wash in the pool of Siloam ere 'he came seeing;' why for this one the process of restoration was instantaneous, while another saw at first 'men as trees, walking.' We are not for an instant to suppose in cures gradually accomplished any restraint on the power of the Lord save such as He willingly imposed on Himself,—and this, doubtless, in each case having reference to, and being explicable by, the moral and spiri-

the meaning which the word more naturally suggests, and our Translation has given. He was *βραδύγλωσσος, ἀγκυλόγλωσσος, ἰσχνόφωνος*, balbutiens, could make no intelligible sounds; but was not absolutely dumb; cf. Isai. xxxii. 4 (LXX): *αἱ γλῶσσαι αἱ ψελλίζουσαι.*

tual state of the person at that time passing under his hand. Our ignorance may prevent us from at once and in every case discerning 'the manifold wisdom' which ordered each work of his, but we are not less sure that this wisdom ordered them all.[1]

This man He first '*took aside from the multitude*;' cf. Mark viii. 23: 'He took the blind man by the hand, and led him out of the town.' But with what intent did He isolate him thus? The Greek Fathers generally reply, for the avoiding of all show and ostentation. But this cannot be, since of all the miracles which He did, we have only two in which any such withdrawal is recorded. Shall we say that there was show and ostentation in all the others? It is not much better to answer, that He might pray with greater freedom.[2] He, whose life was altogether prayer, needed not solitude for this. His purpose was, rather, that the man, apart from the tumult and interruptions of the crowd, in solitude and silence, might be more receptive of deep and lasting impressions; even as the same Lord does now so often lead a soul apart, sets it in the solitude of a sick chamber, or in loneliness of spirit, or takes away from it earthly companions and friends, when He would speak to it words of help and of healing. He takes it aside, as He took this deaf and dumb out of the multitude, that in the hush of the world's din it may listen to Him; as on a greater scale He took his elect people aside into the wilderness, when He would first open their spiritual ear, and deliver unto them his law.

Having this done, Christ '*put his fingers into his ears*,

[1] Maldonatus: Videtur etiam voluisse Christus non semper æqualiter suam divinitatem potentiamque declarare, quod non semper, etiamsi nos causa lateat, convenire judicaret. Aliquando solo verbo dæmones ejicit, mortuos exsuscitat, ostendens se omnino esse Deum; aliquando tactu, salivâ, luto, sanat ægrotos, accommodans quodammodo potentiam suam ad modum agendi causarum naturalium, et ad sensum et consuetudinem hominum.

[2] Calvin: Ut precandi ardorem liberius effundat.

and He spit, and touched his tongue.' These are symbolic actions, which it is easy to see why He should have employed in the case of one afflicted as this man was;—almost all other avenues of communication, save these of sight and feeling, were of necessity closed. Christ by these signs would awaken his faith, and stir up in him the lively expectation of a blessing. The fingers are put into the ears as to bore them, to pierce through the obstacles which hindered sounds from reaching the seat of hearing. This was the fountain-evil; we learn to speak by hearing others speak; but this man did not *speak* plainly, because he did not *hear*; this defect, therefore, is first removed.[1] Then, as often through excessive drought the tongue cleaves to the roof of the mouth, the Lord in what next He does gives a sign of the removal of this evil, of the unloosing of the tongue. At the same time, the healing virtue resides in Himself; He looks not for it from any other quarter; but with the moisture of his own mouth upon his finger touched the tongue which He would release from the bands that held it fast (cf. John ix. 6). It is not for any medicinal virtue that use is made of this moisture, but as the apt symbol of a power residing in, and going forth from, Himself.[2]

St. Mark, abounding as he does in graphic touches, reproducing before our eyes each scene which he narrates, tells us how, this doing '*and looking up to heaven, He sighed.*' He has further preserved for us the very word which He spake, in the very language in which He spake it; He '*saith unto him, Ephphatha, that is, Be opened.*' The

[1] Grotius: Sæpe Christus externo aliquo signo inadspectabilem efficaciam velut spectandam exhibebat. Ita digitis in aures immissis, irrigatâque linguâ, testatum fecit se eum esse cujus vi clausi meatus quasi perterebrarentur, et lingua palato adhærescens motum recuperaret.

[2] Grotius: Nec alio hoc referendum mihi videtur quam quo superiora, ut hoc quoque indicio ostenderetur ab ipso Jesu prodiisse hanc salutiferam virtutem, cum nihil admotum esset affecto corpori, præter ipsa quæ ipsius Jesu erant propria.

'*looking up to heaven*' was a claiming of the divine help (Acts vii. 55); or rather, since the fulness of divine power abode permanently in Him, and not by fitful visitation as in others, an acknowledgment of his oneness with the Father, and that He did only those things which He saw the Father do (cf. Matt. xiv. 19; John v. 19, 20; xi. 41, 42). Some explain the words '*He sighed*,' or '*He groaned*,' which is the rendering of the Rhemish Version, as the deep voice of prayer in which He was at the moment engaged; but rather we may suppose that this poor helpless creature now brought before Him, this living proof of the malice of the devil in deforming the fair features of God's original creation, then wrung that groan from his heart. He who always felt, was yet now in his human soul touched with a liveliest sense of the miseries of the race of man.[1] Thus on another still more memorable occasion, 'He groaned in the spirit, and was troubled' (John xi. 33), with a trouble which had in like manner its source in the thought of all the desolation which sin and death had effected. As there the mourning hearts which were before Him were but as a sample of the mourners of all times and all places, so was this poor man of all the variously afflicted and greatly suffering children of Adam.[2] In the preservation of the actual Aramaic '*Ephphatha*,' which Christ spoke, as in the 'Talitha, cumi' of Mark v. 41, we recognize the narrative of an eye- and ear-witness.

[1] Chrysostom (in Cramer, *Catena*): Τὴν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου φύσιν ἐλεῶν εἰς ποίαν ταπείνωσιν ἤγαγε ταύτην ὅ τε μισόκαλος διάβολος, καὶ ἡ τῶν πρωτοπλάστων ἀπροσεξία.

[2] In the exquisite poem in *The Christian Year* which these words have suggested, this sigh is somewhat differently understood:

'The deaf may hear the Saviour's voice,
The fetter'd tongue its chain may break;
But the deaf heart, the dumb by choice,
The laggard soul that will not wake,
The guilt that scorns to be forgiven;—
These baffle even the spells of Heaven;
In thought of these his brows benign,
Not even in healing, cloudless shine.'

It is quite in this Evangelist's manner to give the actual Aramaic words which Christ used, but adding in each case their interpretation (iii. 17; v. 41; vii. 11; xiv. 36; xv. 34; cf. x. 46; xv. 22). He derived, there can be little doubt, his account from St. Peter, on whose memory the word of power, which wrought so mightily, had indelibly impressed itself.[1] Such word of power now as at all other times it showed itself, for '*straightway his ears were opened, and the string of his tongue was loosed, and he spake plain.*'

The injunction, '*He charged them that they should tell no man,*' implies that the friends of this afflicted man had accompanied or followed Jesus out of the crowd; and having been witnesses of the cure, were now included in the same command not to divulge what they had seen. On the reasons which induced the Lord so often to give this charge of silence something has been said already. On this, as on other occasions (see Matt. ix. 31; Mark i. 44, 45), the charge is nothing regarded by those on whom it is laid; '*the more He charged them, so much the more a great deal they published it.*' The exclamation in which men's surprise and admiration find utterance, '*He hath done all things well,*' reminds us of the words of the first creation (Gen. i. 31[2]), upon which we are thus not unfitly

[1] Grotius: Hæc autem vox *Ephphatha* simul cum salivâ et tactu aurium ac linguæ ex hoc Christi facto ad baptismi ritus postea translata sunt, ut significaretur non minus interna mentis impedimenta tolli per Spiritum Christi, quam in isto homine sublata fuerant sensuum impedimenta. Nam et cor dicitur διανοίγεσθαι, Act. xvi. 14. Imo et cordi aures tribuuntur. The rite to which Grotius refers survives only in the Church of Rome. The touching by the priest of the nostrils and ears of one about to be baptized, with moisture from his mouth, had its origin here; as is indicated by the *Epheta,* which he used at the same time. Ambrose addresses the catechumens thus (*De Init.* i): Aperite igitur aures, et bonum odorem vitæ æternæ inhalatum vobis munere sacramentorum carpite, quod vobis significavimus, cum *apertionis* celebrantes mysterium diceremus *Epheta,* quod est, Adaperire; ut venturus unusquisque ad gratiam, quid interrogaretur cognosceret, quid responderet, meminisse deberet. Cf. the work, *De Sacram.* i. 1, attributed to him; and Höfling, *Das Sacrament der Taufe,* vol. i. pp. 412–417.

[2] Here καλῶς πάντα πεποίηκε: there πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησε, καλὰ λίαν.

thrown back, for Christ's work is in the highest sense 'a new creation.' The notice of St. Matthew, '*and they glorified the God of Israel*' (xv. 31), which may be regarded as belonging to this present time, implies that many of those present were heathens, as we might expect in that half-hellenized region of Decapolis; who, beholding the mighty works which were done, confessed that He who had chosen Israel for his own possession was God above all gods.

25. *THE MIRACULOUS FEEDING OF FOUR THOUSAND.*

MATT. xv. 32–39; MARK viii. 1–9.

ALMOST all which might be said upon this miracle, the preceding miracle, moving in precisely the same sphere of things, has anticipated already.[1] Whether this was wrought nearly in the same region, namely, in the desert country belonging to Bethsaida, and not rather on the western, as the former on the eastern, side of the lake, has been sometimes debated. Most probably the scene of it was almost the same; for thither the narrative of St. Mark has brought the Lord. Leaving the coasts of Tyre and Sidon after the healing of the daughter of the Syrophœnician woman, He again reached the sea of Galilee, and this through the midst of the coasts of Decapolis (vii. 31). But all the cities of the Decapolis save one lay beyond Jordan, and on the eastern side of the lake; this notice therefore places Him on the same side also. The fact that immediately after the miracle He took ship and came to the region of Magdala (Matt. xv. 39), points the same way; since Magdala was certainly on the western side, and He more probably took ship with the intention of crossing the lake than of coasting along its shores.[2]

[1] Augustine (*De Cons. Evang.* ii. 50) observes well that if this miracle had been recorded by Evangelists who had *not* recorded the similar miracle preceding, and by no other, there would inevitably have been some who, assuming the several narratives to be records of one and the same event, would have found here more discrepancies than one between the several Gospels; and he takes occasion hereupon to lay down an important canon of Scripture interpretation; see Archdeacon Lee, *Inspiration of Holy Scripture*, 3rd edit. p. 394.

[2] St. Mark, who for Magdala substitutes Dalmanutha, does not help

With many points of likeness, there are also some points of unlikeness in the two miracles. Here the people had continued with the Lord three days, while on the former occasion nothing of the kind is noted; the provision too is somewhat larger, '*seven loaves and a few little fishes*,' instead of five loaves and two fishes; while the number fed is somewhat smaller, '*four thousand*' now instead of the '*five thousand*' then; and the remaining fragments in this case are only '*seven baskets full*,' while in the former they were '*twelve*.'[1] It does not need to observe that these trivial differences do not in the slightest measure affect the miraculous element in this work of power. At the same time they are well worthy of note, seeing that nothing is more certain than that these mira-

us here, as there are no further traces of this place. That it was on the western side of the lake we conclude from the fact that Christ's leaving it and crossing the lake is described as a departing εἰς τὸ πέραν, an expression in the New Testament applied almost exclusively to the country east of the Lake and of Jordan. In some maps Magdala is placed at the S.E. of the lake; but this is a mistake; it is most probably the modern El-Madschdel, lying at the S.W., and in the neighbourhood of Tiberias. So Greswell, *Diss.* vol. ii. p. 324; Winer, *Realwörterbuch*, s. v. Magdala; Robinson, *Biblical Researches*, vol. iii. p. 278.

[1] All four Evangelists, in narrating the first miracle, describe the baskets as κοφίνους, while the two who relate the second agree in calling them σπυρίδας. That this variation was not accidental is clear from our Lord's after words; when referring to the two miracles, He preserves the distinction, asking his disciples how many κοφίνους on the first occasion they gathered up; how many σπυρίδας on the second (Matt. xvi. 9, 10; Mark viii. 19, 20). What the distinction was, is more difficult to say. The derivation of κόφινος from κόπτω (= ἀγγεῖον πλεκτόν, Suidas), and σπυρίς from σπεῖρα, does not help us, as each points to the baskets being of wicker-work; see, however, another derivation of σπυρίς in Greswell (*Diss.* vol. ii. p. 358), and the distinction which he seeks to draw from it. *Why* the Twelve should have been provided with either has been variously explained. Some say, to carry their own provisions with them, while they were travelling through a polluted land, such as Samaria. Greswell suggests that they might sleep in them, so long as they were compelled to lodge *sub dio*; and quotes Juvenal (*Sat.* iii. 13): Judæis, quorum *cophinus* fœnumque supellex; cf. Martial (*Epigr.* v. 7), who mockingly calls the Jews cistiferos. It appears from Acts ix. 25 that the σπυρίς (= σαργάνη, 2 Cor. xi. 32) might be of size sufficient to contain a man; compare Blunt, *Undesigned Coincidences*, 1847, p. 271.

culous features of the second miracle would have surpassed those of the first, had we here to do with mythical and unhistorical traditions. Legend grows; the new outdoes the old; but here it does not even stand on an equality with it; the numbers fed are smaller; the supply of food is larger; the fragments that remain over are fewer.

At first it excites some surprise that the disciples, with that other miracle fresh in their memories, should on this later occasion have been as seriously perplexed how the multitude should be fed as they were on the former. Yet this surprise rises out of our ignorance of man's heart, of our own heart, and of the deep root of unbelief which is there. It is evermore thus in times of difficulty and distress. All former deliverances are in danger of being forgotten;[1] the mighty interpositions of God's hand in former passages of men's lives fall out of their remembrance; each new difficulty appears as one from which there is no extrication; at each recurring necessity it seems as though the wonders of God's grace have come utterly to an end. He may have divided the Red Sea for his people, yet no sooner are they on the other side, than they murmur against Moses, and count that they must perish for thirst, crying, 'Is the Lord among us, or not?' (Exod. xvii. 1–7); or, to adduce a still nearer parallel, He who opens his hand and fills all things living with plenteousness may have once already covered the camp with quails (Exod. xvi. 13), yet for all this even Moses himself cannot believe that He will provide flesh for all that multitude (Num. xi. 21, 22). It is only the man of a full-formed faith, of a faith which Apostles themselves at this time did not possess, who argues from the past to the future, and truly derives confidence from God's former dealings of faithfulness and love (cf. 1 Sam. xvii. 34–37; 2 Chron. xvi. 7, 8). Only a

[1] Calvin: Quia autem similis quotidie nobis obrepit torpor, eo magis cavendum est ne unquam distrahantur mentes nostræ a reputandis Dei beneficiis, ut præteriti temporis experientia in futurum idem nos sperare doceat, quod jam semel vel sæpius largitus est Deus.

strange unacquaintance with the heart of man could have led any to argue that the disciples, with their previous experience of one miracle of this kind, *could not* on a second similar occasion have been perplexed how the wants of the multitude should be supplied; that we have therefore here an illustration of the general inaccuracy which prevails in the records of our Lord's life, of a loose tradition, which has told the same event twice over.

Moreover their perplexity is capable of another explanation. The disciples, perfectly remembering how their Master had once spread a table in the wilderness, might still have doubted whether He would choose a second time to put forth his creative might;—whether there was in these present multitudes that spiritual hunger, which was worthy of being met and rewarded by such an interposition of divine power; whether they too were seeking the kingdom of heaven and its righteousness, and might therefore claim to have all other things, those also which pertain to this lower life, added unto them.[1] But such earnest seekers, for the time at least, they were; and as others had faith to be healed, so these had faith to be fed; and the same bounteous hand which fed the five thousand before, fed the four thousand now.

[1] It is at least an ingenious allegory which has found favour with Hilary and with Augustine, namely, that these two miracles severally set forth Christ's communication of Himself to the Jew and to the Gentile; that as the first is a parable of the Jewish people finding in Him the satisfaction of their spiritual need, so this second, in which the people came from far, even from the far country of idols, is a parable of the Gentile world finding the same. The details of his application may be of no very great value; but the perplexity of the Apostles here concerning the supply of the new needs, notwithstanding all that they had already witnessed, will then exactly answer to the slowness with which they, as the ministers of the new Kingdom, recognized that Christ was as freely given to, and was as truly the portion of, the Gentile as the Jew. Augustine's sermon on this matter the Benedictine Edd. relegate to the *Appendix* (*Serm.* lxxxi.), but the passage about Eutyches is evidently an interpolation; and the rest is so entirely in Augustine's manner, that I have not hesitated to refer to it as his. Compare Hilary: Sicut autem illa turba quam prius pavit, Judaicæ credentium convenit turbæ, ita hæc populo gentium comparatur.

26. *THE OPENING THE EYES OF ONE BLIND AT BETHSAIDA.*

MARK viii. 22–26.

A MIRACLE peculiar to St. Mark, and in many of its circumstances closely resembling another, which he has recorded a little while before (vii. 31–37). Its treatment therefore in some most important features has been anticipated. As the Lord took that other sufferer, of whom the same Evangelist alone keeps a record, 'aside from the multitude' (vii. 33), even so '*He took the blind man by the hand, and led him out of the town*;'[1] and with the same moisture from his own mouth wrought his cure. The Lord, as was so often his custom, veiling more or less the miraculous in the miracle, links on his power to means already in use among men; working through these means something higher than they could themselves have brought about, and clothing the supernatural in the forms of the natural. Thus did He, for example, when He bade his disciples to anoint the sick with oil,—one of the most esteemed helps for healing in the East (Mark vi. 13; cf. Jam. v. 14). Not the oil, but his word, should heal; yet without the oil the disciples might have found it too hard to believe in the power which they were exerting,—those who could only be healed through their faith, to believe in the power which should heal them. So the figs laid on Hezekiah's boil were indeed the very remedy which a physician with only natural appliances at command would have used (Isai.

[1] Bengel: Cæco visum recuperanti lætior erat aspectus cæli et operum divinorum in naturâ, quam operum humanorum in pago.

xxxviii. 21; cf. 2 Kin. ii. 20, 21); yet now, hiding itself behind this nature, clothing itself in the forms of this nature, an effectual work of preternatural healing went forward.

The feature which most distinguishes this miracle is the progressive character of the cure. This, it is true, is not itself without analogies in other cases, as in that of the man blind from his birth, who only after he had washed in Siloam, 'came seeing' (John ix. 7); yet the steps of the progress are marked with greater emphasis here than in any other instance. For, first, after the Lord '*had spit on his eyes, and put his hands upon him, He asked him if he saw aught. And he looked up, and said, I see men, as trees, walking.*' Certain moving forms he saw about him, but without the power of discerning their shape or magnitude,—trees he should have accounted them from their height, and men from their motion.[1] But the good Physician leaves not his work unfinished: '*After that He put his hands again upon his eyes,*[2] *and made him look up; and he was restored, and saw every man clearly.*'

Chrysostom and others find the explanation of this gradual cure in the imperfection of this blind man's faith. Proof of this imperfection they see in the fact, that, while others in a like calamity did themselves beseech the Lord that He would open their eyes, this man was brought to Him by others, as one who himself scarcely expected a benefit. The gracious Lord, who would not reject, but who could as little cure so long as there was on his part this

[1] In Cheselden's interesting account (*Anatomy*, London, 1768, p. 301) of the experience of one who, having been blind from his birth, was enabled to see, a curious confirmation of the truthfulness of this narrative occurs: 'When he first saw, he knew not the shape of any thing, nor any one thing from another, however different in shape or magnitude; but being told what things were, whose forms he before knew from feeling, he would carefully observe, that he might know them again.'

[2] Chemnitz (*Harm. Evang.* 84): Manus imponit ut ostendat carnem suam esse instrumentum per quod et cum quo ipse ὁ Λόγος æternus omnia opera vivificationis perficiat.

desperation of healing, vouchsafed to him a glimpse of the blessing, so to awaken in him a longing for its fulness, and, this longing once awakened, presently satisfied him with that fulness. To the rest of the world, this healing step by step is a testimony of the freeness of God's grace, which is linked to no single way of manifestation, but works in divers manners, sometimes accomplishing only little by little what at other times it brings about in a moment.[1] And certainly no symbol more suitable could be found of the progressive steps by which He who is 'the Light of the world' makes sometimes the souls that come to Him partakers of the illumination of his grace. Not all at once are the old errors and the old confusions put to flight; not all at once do men see clearly: for a while there is much of their old blindness remaining, much for a season impairing the clearness of their vision; they see men but as trees, walking. Yet in good time Christ completes the work which He has begun. 'The author,' He is also 'the finisher of their faith;' He lays his hands on them anew, and they see every man clearly.[2]

'*And He sent him away to his house, saying, Neither go into the town, nor tell it to any in the town*' (cf. Matt. ix. 30; Mark i. 44; vii. 36). The first of these commands seems to contain, and in fact, does contain, the second; for if he did not '*go into the town*,' it is certain he could not '*tell it*

[1] Calvin: Paulatim cæco visum restituit: quod ideo factum esse probabile est, ut documentum in hoc homine statueret liberæ suæ dispensationis, nec se astrictum esse ad certam normam, quin hoc vel illo modo virtutem suam proferret. Oculos ergo cæci non statim ita illuminat ut officio suo fungantur, sed obscurum illis confusumque intuitum instillat: deinde alterâ manuum impositione integram aciem illis reddit. Ita gratia Christi, quæ in alios repente effusa prius erat, quasi guttatim defluxit in hunc hominem.

[2] Bede: Quem uno verbo totum simul curare poterat, paulatim curat, ut magnitudinem humanæ cæcitatis ostendat, quæ vix et quasi per gradus ad lucem redeat, et gratiam suam nobis indicet, per quam singula perfectionis incrementa adjuvat. Quod autem eum in domum ire præcepit, mystice admonet omnes qui cognitione veritatis illustrantur, ut ad cor suum redeant, et quantum sibi donatum sit sollicitâ mente perpendant.

to any in the town;' but St. Mark loves emphatic statements of this kind, and by such repetitions to secure a strong impression on the minds of his readers. Whether on this occasion the Lord was better obeyed than on very many similar (Matt. ix. 31; Mark i. 45; vii. 36) we are not told.

27. *THE HEALING OF THE LUNATIC CHILD.*

MATT. xvii. 14–21; MARK ix. 14–29; LUKE ix. 37–42.

THE old adversaries of our Lord, the Scribes, had taken advantage of his absence on the Mount of Transfiguration, to win a temporary triumph over such of his disciples as He had left behind Him. These had undertaken to cast out an evil spirit of a peculiar malignity, and had proved unequal to the task; '*they could not*'—weakened as they were by the absence of their Lord; and with Him, of three, the principal among themselves—the three in whom, as habitually the nearest to Him, we may suppose his power most mightily resided. It was here again, as it was once before during the absence of Moses with his servant Joshua, on his mount of a fainter transfiguration (Exod. xxxiv. 29). Then, too, in like manner, the enemy, profiting by his absence, awhile prevailed against the people (Exod. xxxii.). And now the Scribes were pressing to the uttermost the temporary advantage which they had gained by this miscarriage of the disciples. A great multitude were gathered round, spectators of the defeat of Christ's servants; and the strife was at the highest—the Scribes, no doubt, arguing from the impotence of the servants to the impotence of the Master,[1] and those denying the conclusion; when suddenly He about whom the strife was, appeared, returning from the holy Mount, his face and person yet glistening, as there is reason to

[1] Calvin: Scribæ victores insultant, nec modo subsannant discipulos, sed proterviunt adversus Christum, quasi in illorum personâ exinanita esset ejus virtus.

believe, with traces of the glory which had clothed Him there,—and which had not quite faded thus far into the light of common day. But very different was the impression which that glory made from the impression made by the countenance of Moses. When the multitude saw the lawgiver of the elder Covenant, as he came down from *his* mountain, the skin of his face shining, 'they were afraid to come nigh him' (Exod. xxxiv. 30); for that glory upon his face was a *threatening* glory, the awful and intolerable brightness of the law. But the glory of God shining in the face of Christ Jesus, though awful too, is an *attractive* glory, full of grace and beauty; it draws men to Him, does not drive them from Him; and thus, indeed, '*all the people, when they beheld Him, were greatly amazed,*' such gleams of brightness arrayed Him still; yet did they not therefore flee from Him; but rather, as being the more allured by that brightness, '*running to Him, saluted Him*'[1] (cf. 2 Cor. iii. 18).

Yet the sights and sounds which greeted Him on his return to our sinful world, how different were they from those which He had just quitted upon the holy Mount! There the highest harmonies of heaven; here some of the wildest and harshest discords of earth.[2] There He had been receiving from the Father honour and glory (2 Pet. i. 17); here his disciples, those to whom his work had been

[1] Bengel with his usual beauty: Tangebantur a gloriâ, etiamsi nescirent quid in monte actum esset; cf. Marc. x. 32; Luc. xix. 11; nec non Ex. iv. 14; xxxiv. 29. Occultam cum Deo conversationem facile sentias majorem hominum erga te proclivitatem insequi. Theophylact mentions, though he does not adopt, this explanation: Τινὲς δέ φασιν ὅτι ἡ ὄψις αὐτοῦ ὡραιοτέρα γινομένη ἀπὸ τοῦ φωτὸς τῆς μεταμορφώσεως, ἐφείλκετο τοὺς ὄχλους πρὸς τὸ ἀσπάζεσθαι. Corn. a Lapide: Quod viderent in vultu Jesu paulo ante transfigurato reliquos adhuc aliquos splendoris radios, sicut Mosi post Dei colloquium in vultu adhæserunt radii, et quasi cornua lucis.

[2] These mighty and wondrous contrasts have been embodied by Christian Art. In them lies the *idea* of Raphael's picture of the Transfiguration, and its two parts, which in these their contrasts so marvellously sustain one another.

intrusted in his absence, had been procuring for Him, as far as in them lay, shame, defeat, and dishonour. But as when some great captain, suddenly arriving upon a battle-field, where his subordinate lieutenants have wellnigh lost the day and brought all into an almost hopeless confusion, with his eye measures at once the necessities of the hour, and with no more than his presence causes the tide of victory to turn, and everything to right itself again, so was it now. The Lord arrests the advancing and victorious foe: He addresses Himself to the Scribes; with the words, '*What question ye with them?*' taking the baffled and hard-pressed disciples under his own protection, and declaring that whatever question there was more, it must be with Himself. The Scribes, so forward to dispute with the servants, do not so readily accept the challenge of the Master. The disciples are as little forward to proclaim their own defeat; and thus '*one of the multitude*,' the father of the afflicted child on whom the ineffectual attempt at healing had been made, is the first to speak; '*kneeling down to Him, and saying, Lord, have mercy on my son*;' and with this declaring the miserable case of his child, his only one, as St. Luke imforms us (cf. vii. 12), and the little help he had obtained from the disciples.

St. Mark paints the whole scene with the hand of a master, and his account of this miracle, compared with those of the other Evangelists, would alone suffice to vindicate for him an original character, and to refute the notion of some, that we have in his Gospel nothing more than an epitome and abridgment, now of the first, and now of the third.[1] All the symptoms, as put into the

[1] Even Augustine consents too far to this unworthy estimate of the second Gospel (*De Cons. Evang.* i. 2): Divus Marcus eum [Matthæum] subsequutus, tanquam pedissequus et breviator ejus videtur. He has enough of perfectly independent notices, his and his only, to justify our claim of quite another position for him and for his Gospel. I subjoin references to some of these: i. 13, 20, 29, 35; ii. 3, 14, 27; iii. 5, 17, 34; iv. 26–29, 36, 38; v. 4, 13, 20, 42, 43; vi. 13, 40, 43, 48; vii. 32–37;

father's mouth, or described by the sacred historians, exactly agree with those of epilepsy;—not that we have here *only* an epileptic; but this was the ground on which the deeper spiritual evils of this child were superinduced. The fits were sudden and lasted remarkably long; the evil spirit '*hardly departeth from him;*'—'*a dumb spirit,*' St. Mark calls it, a statement which does not contradict that of St. Luke, '*he suddenly crieth out*;' this dumbness was only in respect of articulate sounds; he could give no utterance to these. Nor was it a natural defect, as where the string of the tongue has remained unloosed (Mark vii. 32), or the needful organs for speech are wanting; nor yet a defect under which he had always laboured; but the consequence of this possession. When the spirit took him in its might, then in these paroxysms of his disorder it tare him, till he foamed[1] and gnashed with his teeth: and altogether he pined away like one the very springs of whose life were dried up.[2] And while these accesses of

viii. 14, 22–26; ix. 49; x. 16, 17, 21, 46, 50; xi. 16, 20, 21; xiii. 3, 32; xiv. 51, 52, 58; xv. 7, 21, 44; xvi. 7, 16–18. Let me add that, as all those who have followed up the latest investigations of German and Dutch scholars into the origin of the Gospels, and their relations one to another, are aware, there is a growing tendency at the present date (1869) to ascribe the very highest importance to the Gospel of St. Mark, and sometimes at the expense of the other Gospels. Thus see Klostermann, *Das Marcusevangelium nach seinem Quellenwerthe*, 1867; Scholten, *Das älteste Evangelium*, Leyden, 1868.

[1] Lucian (*Philopseudes*, 16) has ironical allusions, as I must needs think, to this and other cures of demoniacs by our Lord: Πάντες ἴσασι τὸν Σύρον τὸν ἐκ τῆς Παλαιστίνης, τὸν ἐπὶ τούτων σοφιστὴν, ὅσους παραλαβὼν καταπίπτοντας πρὸς τὴν σελήνην καὶ τὼ ὀφθαλμὼ διαστρέφοντας, καὶ ἀφροῦ πιμπλαμένους τὸ στόμα, ὅμως ἀνίστησι καὶ ἀποπέμπει ἀρτίους, ἐπὶ μισθῷ μεγάλῳ ἀπαλλάξας τῶν δεινῶν. There is much of interest in the passage, besides what I have quoted.

[2] If indeed ξηραίνεται has not reference to the stiffness and starkness, the unnatural rigidity of the limbs, in the accesses of the disorder; cf. 2 Kin. xiii. 4, LXX. Such, though not its primary, might well be its secondary, meaning; since that which is *dried up* loses its pliability, and the father is describing not the general pining away of his son, but his symptoms when the paroxysm took him. The σεληνιαζόμενοι (in other Greek σεληνιακοί, σεληνόβλητοι) are mentioned once besides in the New Testament (Matt. iv. 24), where they are distinguished from the δαιμονιζόμενοι. The distinction, whatever it was, in the popular language would

his disorder might come upon him at any moment and in any place, they exposed him to the worst accidents: '*ofttimes he falleth into the fire, and oft into the water.*' In St. Mark the father attributes these fits to the direct agency of the evil spirit: '*ofttimes it hath cast him into the fire, and into the waters, to destroy him*;' yet such calamities might equally be looked at as the natural consequences of his unhappy condition.[1]

The father concludes his sad tale with a somewhat reproachful reference to the futile efforts of the disciples to aid him; and declares what impotent exorcists they had proved: '*I spake to thy disciples that they should cast him out, and they could not.*' We have two explanations of our Lord's words of sorrowful indignation which follow, '*O faithless and perverse generation* (cf. Deut. xxxii. 5, LXX; Phil. ii. 15), *how long shall I be with you? how long shall I suffer you?*' For some, as for Origen, this '*faithless generation*' is the disciples, and they only; and this an utterance of holy impatience at the weakness of their faith, whom so brief a separation from Him had shorn of their strength, and left powerless against the kingdom of darkness; and

continually disappear; and the father saying of his son σεληνιάζεται does but express the fact, or rather the consequence, of his possession. The word, like *μανία* (from *μήνη*) and *lunaticus*, originally embodied the belief, not altogether unfounded, of the injurious influence of the moon (Ps. cxxi. 6) on the human frame (see Creuzer, *Symbolik*, vol. ii. p. 571).

[1] These extracts will abundantly justify what was said above of the symptoms of this child's case being those of one taken with epilepsy. Cælius Aurelianus (*Morb. Chron.* i. 4): Alii [epileptici] publicis in locis cadendo fœdantur, adjunctis etiam externis periculis, loci causâ præcipites dati, aut in flumina vel mare cadentes. And Paulus Ægineta, the last of the great physicians of the old world, describing epilepsy (iii. 13), might almost seem to have borrowed his account from this history: Morbus comitialis est convulsio totius corporis cum principalium actionum læsione, . . . fit hæc affectio maxime pueris, postea vero etiam in adolescentibus et in vigore consistentibus. Instante vero jam symptomate collapsio ipsis derepente contingit et convulsio, et quandoque nihil significans exclamatio [*ἐξαίφνης κράζει*, Luke ix. 39]. Præcipuum vero ipsorum signum est oris spuma [*μετὰ ἀφροῦ*, Luke ix. 39]. See on the medical aspects of this disease and its cure Hobart, *On the Medical Language of St. Luke*, pp. 17–20.

the after discourse (Matt. xvii. 20) favours such an application. But Chrysostom, and generally the early interpreters, pointedly *exclude* the disciples from the rebuke; apply it to the surrounding multitude alone; whom certainly the term '*generation*' seems better to suit; in whom the Lord beholds samples of the whole Jewish people, the father himself representing only too well the unbelieving temper of the whole generation to which he pertained, and therefore sharing largely in the rebuke. This in St. Mark is directly addressed to him, though not restricted to him, but intended to pass on to many more. It will be best, I think, to understand the words as not exclusively aimed at the disciples, nor chiefly; but addressed primarily to the multitude and the father. They, however, with all others that are present, are included in the rebuke; their unfaithfulness and unbelief had for the time brought them back to a level with their nation, and they must share with it all in a common condemnation. '*How long shall I be with you?*' are words not so much of one longing to put off the coil of flesh,[1] as of a master, complaining of the slowness and dulness of his scholars; 'Have I abode with you all this time, and have you profited so little by my teaching?' Till their task is learned, He must tarry with them still.[2] We may compare his words to Philip, 'Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known Me, Philip?' (John xiv. 9.)

And now, since the help which is done on earth, He must Himself do it, He exclaims, '*Bring him hither to Me.*' As the staff in Gehazi's hand could not arouse the dead child, but the prophet himself must arrive and undertake

[1] Jerome (*Comm. in Matt.* in loc.): Non quod tædio superatus sit, et mansuetus ac mitis; . . . sed quod in similitudinem medici si ægrotum videat contra sua præcepta se gerere dicat: Usquequo accedam ad domum tuam, quousque artis perdam industriam; me aliud jubente et te aliud perpetrante?

[2] Bengel: Festinabat ad Patrem: nec tamen abitum se facere posse sciebat, priusquam discipulos ad fidem perduxisset. Molesta erat tarditas eorum.

the work, if it were to be done at all, so is it now (2 Kin. iv. 31). Yet the first bringing of the child to Jesus causes another of the fearful paroxysms of his disorder, so that '*when he saw Him, straightway the spirit tare him, and he fell on the ground, and wallowed foaming.*' The kingdom of Satan in small and in great is ever stirred into a fiercer activity by the coming near of the kingdom of Christ. Satan has great wrath, when his time is short.[1] But as the Lord on occasion of another difficult and perilous cure (Mark v. 9) Himself began a conversation with the sufferer, seeking thus to inspire him with confidence, to bring back something of calmness to his soul, so does He now with the representative of the sufferer, the father, being precluded by the child's actual condition from doing this with himself: '*How long is it ago since this came unto him?*' The father answers, '*Of a child*,' and, for the stirring of more pity, describes again the miserable perils in which these fits involved his child; at the same time ill content that anything should come before the healing, if a healing were possible, having, also, present to his mind the recent discomfiture of the disciples, he adds, '*If Thou canst do anything, have compassion on us, and help us*'—'Thou,' that is, 'more than these, whose failure is so conspicuous.' In that '*us*,' we see how entirely his own life is knit up with his child's: as the woman of Canaan, pleading for her daughter, had cried, 'Have mercy on *me*' (Matt. xv. 22). At the same time he reveals by that '*if*,' that he has come with no unquestioning faith in the power of Christ to aid, but is rendering the difficult cure more difficult still by his own doubts and unbelief.

Our Lord's answer is not without its difficulty, which our Version has rather evaded than met; but its sense is plainly the following: 'That "*if*" of thine, that uncertainty whether anything can be done for thy child or

[1] Calvin: Quo propior affulget Christi gratia, et efficacius agit, eo impotentius furit Satan.

not, is to be resolved by thee, and not by Me. There is a condition without which he cannot be healed; but the fulfilling of the condition lies with thyself and no other. The absence of faith on thy part, and not any overmastering power in this malignant spirit, is that which straitens Me; if this cure is hard, it is thou that renderest it so. Thou hast said, "If *I* can do anything;" but the question is, "*if thou canst believe*;" this is the hinge upon which all must turn'—and then with a pause, and not merely completing the sentence, as in our Version,[1] '*all things are possible to him that believeth.*' Thus faith is here, as in every other case, set as the condition of healing; on other occasions it is the faith of the person; but here, that being impossible, the father's is accepted instead; even as the Syrophœnician mother's in the room of her daughter's (Matt. xv. 22). And thus too the Lord appears in some sort a *μαιευτὴς πίστεως*, helping the birth of faith in that travailing soul; even as at length, though with pain and sore travail, it comes to the birth, so that the father '*cried out and said with tears, Lord, I believe*;'[2] and then, the little spark of faith which has been kindled in his soul revealing to him the abysmal depths of unbelief which are there, he adds this further: '*help Thou mine unbelief.*'[3] For thus it is ever: only in the light of the actual presence of a grace in the soul does that soul perceive the strength and prevalence of the opposing corruption. Till then it had no measure by which to take the measure of its own

[1] The words, I take it, should be pointed thus: *τὸ, εἰ δύνασαι πιστεῦσαι· πάντα δυνατὰ τῷ πιστεύοντι·* and Bengel enters rightly into the construction of the first clause, explaining it thus: Hoc, si potes credere, res est; hoc agitur. Calvin: Tu me rogas ut subveniam quoad potero; atqui inexhaustum virtutis fontem in me reperies, si modo afferas satis amplam fidei mensuram.

[2] Thomas Jackson, the great Arminian divine, says well: 'This word, belief, is not a term indivisible, but admits of many degrees, as well for the certainty of the assent or apprehension, as for the radication of the truth, rightly apprehended, in men's hearts or centre of their affections.'

[3] Augustine, *Serm.* xliii. 6, 7.

deficiency. Only he who believes, guesses aught of unbelief.

When now this prime condition of healing is no longer wanting on his part, the Lord, meeting and rewarding even the weak beginnings of his faith, accomplishes the cure; and the more promptly when '*He saw that the people came running*,' that an agitation and excitement was beginning which He desired at once to check. How majestic, in his address to the foul spirit, is that '*I charge thee*.[1] No longer those whom thou mayest hope to disobey, against whom thou mayest venture to struggle, but I, having all power in heaven and on earth, *charge thee, come out of him*' (cf. Luke iv. 35). Nor is this all: he shall '*enter no more into him*;' his return is barred; he shall not take advantage of his long possession presently to come back (Matt. xii. 43), and re-assert his dominion; the cure shall be at once perfect and lasting. The wicked spirit must obey; but he does so most unwillingly; what he can no longer retain he would, if he might, destroy; as Fuller, with a wit which is 'in season and out of season,' expresses it, 'like an outgoing tenant, that cares not what mischief he does.'[2] So fearful was this last paroxysm, so entirely had it exhausted all the powers of the child, that '*he was as one dead; insomuch that many said, He is dead; but Jesus took him by the hand and lifted him up*;' and life from that touch of the Lord of life flowing into him anew, '*he arose*:' even as often elsewhere a revivifying power is

[1] Bengel: Ἐγώ σοι ἐπιτάσσω. *Ego*, antitheton ad discipulos, qui non valuerant.

[2] Grègory the Great (*Moral.* xxxii. 19): Ecce eum non discerpserat cum tenebat, exiens discerpsit: quia nimirum tunc pejus cogitationes mentis dilaniat, cum jam egressui divinâ virtute compulsus appropinquat. Et quem mutus possederat, cum clamoribus deserebat: quia plerumque cum possidet, minora tentamenta irrogat: cum vero de corde pellitur, acriori infestatione perturbat. Cf. *Hom.* xii. *in Ezek.*; and H. de Sto. Victore: Dum puer ad Dominum accedit, eliditur: quia conversi ad Dominum plerumque a dæmonio gravius pulsantur, ut vel ad vitia reducantur, vel de suâ expulsione se vindicet diabolus.

by the same channel conveyed (Dan. x. 8, 9, 10; Rev. i. 17; Matt. viii. 15; xvii. 6–8). Of the son of the widow of Nain we are expressly told that the Lord, having recalled to life, '*delivered him to his mother*' (Luke vii. 15). The same Evangelist, and he only, records of this child whom Christ had thus healed, that He '*delivered him again to his father*,' crowning so the work of grace.

'*Then*'—'*when He was come into the house*,' as we learn from St. Mark—'*came the disciples to Jesus apart, and said, Why could not we cast him out?*' Where, they would fain know, was the secret of their defeat, seeing that they were not exceeding their commission (Matt. x. 8), and had on former occasions found the devils subject to them (Luke x. 17)? '*And Jesus said unto them, Because of your unbelief*,'[1] because of their lack of that to which, and to which only, all things are possible. They had made but a languid use of the means for stirring up and increasing faith; while yet, though the locks of their strength were shorn, they would 'go out as at other times before' against their enemies, being certain to be foiled whenever they encountered an enemy of peculiar malignity. And such they encountered here; for the phrase '*this kind*' marks that there are orders of evil spirits, that as there is a hierarchy of heaven, so is there an inverted hierarchy of hell. The same is intimated in the mention of the unclean spirit going and taking 'seven other spirits *more wicked than himself*' (Matt. xii. 45); and at Ephes. vi. 12, there is probably a climax, mounting up from one degree of spiritual power and malignity to another. '*This kind*,' He declares, '*goeth not out but by prayer and fasting*.' The faith which shall be effectual against this must be a faith exercised in

[1] For ἀπιστίαν here many important MSS. and Versions read ὀλιγοπιστίαν, which has found its way into Lachmann's and Tischendorf's text; but hardly with right. Ἀπιστίαν may have seemed to some transcribers too strong a word; the disciples being often elsewhere in the Gospels charged with little faith (Matt. vi. 30; viii. 26; xiv. 31; xvi. 8), but never, except indeed Thomas once (John xx. 27), with none.

prayer, that has not relaxed itself by an habitual compliance with the demands of the lower nature, but has often girt itself up to an austerer rule, to rigour and self-denial.

But as the secret of all weakness is in unbelief, so of all strength in faith: '*For verily I say unto you, If ye have faith as a grain of mustard-seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place, and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you.*' The image re-appears with some modifications, Luke xvii. 6; and St. Paul probably alludes to these words of his Lord, 1 Cor. xiii. 2. Many explain '*faith as a grain of mustard-seed*' to mean *lively* faith, with allusion to the keen and biting powers of that grain.[1] But it is not on this side that the comparison should be urged; rather, it is the *smallest* faith, with a tacit contrast between a grain of mustard-seed, a very small thing (Matt. xiii. 31, 32), and a mountain, a very great. That smallest shall be effectual to work on this largest. The least spiritual power, which is really such, shall be strong to overthrow in the end the mightiest powers which are merely of this world.

[1] Augustine (*Serm.* ccxlvi.): Modicum videtur granum sinapis; nihil contemtibilius adspectu, nihil fortius gustu. Quod quid est aliud, nisi maximus ardor et intima vis fidei in Ecclesiâ?

28. *THE FINDING OF THE STATER IN THE FISH'S MOUTH.*

Matt. xvii. 24–27.

ST. MATTHEW alone among the Evangelists relates this gracious little incident, with the miracle which crowns it. Before we close our study of it, it will be abundantly clear why, if one Gospel only were to record it, then it fell most fitly to that of St. Matthew, which is eminently the Gospel of the kingdom, of the King and the King's Son. Slight as the incident may seem, it is one full of the profoundest teaching, however this may by us be sometimes imperfectly apprehended, and sometimes missed altogether. We read then here: '*And when they were come to Capernaum, they that received tribute-money came to Peter, and said, Doth not your Master pay tribute?*' I should much prefer to read the last words here, '*Doth not your Master pay the half-shekel?*' as indeed in the R. V. has been done. The reader may not at once understand what is meant, but he is put on the right track for understanding; '*tribute*,' on the other hand, like Luther's 'zinsgroschen,' almost inevitably leads him astray, so that he confounds or identifies the question here with that which the Pharisee propounded to the Lord, whether, that is, it was lawful to pay tribute to Cæsar or not (Matt. xxii. 17). But indeed the evidence is overwhelming that we have nothing here to do with tribute to Cæsar nor with any civil impost whatever; but rather and only with a theocratic payment, due to the temple and the temple's God. Ques-

tions altogether different in fact are here at issue and there.

It is true that some, and these not inconsiderable, names are found ranged on the other side. Thus Clement of Alexandria,[1] Origen, Augustine,[2] Jerome, Sedulius,[3] all understand by this '*tribute*' a civil payment; and find here the same lesson as at Rom. xiii. 1–7: 'Let every soul be subject to the higher powers. . . . . Render therefore to all their dues, tribute to whom tribute is due,'—the lesson, that is, of an obedience for conscience sake to the civil power.

These, however, and others have gone astray, as I am persuaded, rather from not having the right interpretation before them, than from any deliberate preference of the other. The evidence that the payment demanded here is not tribute to Cæsar, but dues to the temple, is such as may well convince every one before whom it is fairly brought. In the first place, this '*half-shekel*' which the collectors here demand, was exactly the ransom of souls, the half-shekel (Exod. xxx. 11–16; xxxviii. 25, 26) to be paid by every Israelite above twenty years old to the service

[1] Τὸν στατῆρα τοῖς τελώναις δοὺς, τὰ Καίσαρος ἀποδοὺς τῷ Καίσαρι.

[2] *De Catechiz. Rud.* 21: Ipse Dominus, ut nobis hujus sanæ doctrinæ præberet exemplum, pro capite hominis, quo erat indutus, tributum solvere non dedignatus est.

[3] Tributum Cæsareum he calls it. Add to these Calvin, who however has a glimpse of the truth, and Maldonatus, for once consenting with him who is the great object of his polemical hate. Wolf in like manner (*Curæ*, in loc.) has the wrong interpretation; and Petitus (*Crit. Sac.* ix. 2566); Corn. a Lapide; Calov, and recently, after any further mistake seemed impossible, Wieseler (*Chronol. Synops.* p. 265, seq.) has returned to the old error. The true meaning has been perfectly seized by Hilary (in loc.); by Ambrose (*Ep.* vii. *ad Justum*, 12); in the main by Chrysostom (*In Matt. Hom.* liv.) and Theophylact, who have yet both gone astray upon Num. iii. 40–51; by Theodoret (*Quæst. in Num. Inter.* 9); and in later times by Cameron (*Crit. Sac.* in loc.); by Freher (*Ibid.* vol. ix. p. 3633); by Jeremy Taylor (*Life of Christ*, part iii. § xiv. 13); by Hammond, Grotius, Lightfoot, Bengel, Michaëlis, Olshausen, Stier, Greswell (*Diss.* vol. ii. p. 376), Bleek, Alford, Ellicott (*Life of our Lord*, p. 229), Keim, Farrar, and Steinmeyer (*Wunderthaten des Herrn*, p. 218).

and current expenses of the tabernacle, or, as it afterwards would be, of the temple.[1] It does not, indeed, appear at first as an annual payment, but only as payable on the occasions, not frequently recurring, of the numbering of the people. But it became annual, whether this had been intended from the first, or out of a later custom. Thus there are distinct notices of this payment in the times of the Kings. Joash devotes to the reparation of the temple funds to be derived from three sources; the first of these being this half-shekel, 'the money that every man is set at' (2 Kin. xii. 4); 'the collection that Moses, the servant of God, laid upon Israel in the wilderness,' as it is called in the parallel record in Chronicles (2 Chron. xxiv. 9).[2] At a later day, it is the *third* part of a shekel, and not the *half*, which the Jews impose upon themselves (Nehem. x.

[1] A word or two to explain τὰ δίδραχμα, which appears in the Greek text, and which I have proposed to render, not '*the didrachms*,' though I should have preferred this to '*tribute*,' but '*the half-shekel*.' Before the Babylonian exile, the shekel was only a certain weight of silver, not a coin. The Maccabees, however (1 Macc. xv. 6), received the privilege, or won the right, from the kings of Syria of coining their own money; and the shekels, half-shekels, and quarter-shekels now in the cabinets of collectors are to be referred to their time. These growing scarce, and not being coined any more, it became the custom to estimate the temple-dues as two drachms (the δίδραχμον here required), a sum actually somewhat larger than the half-shekel, as shown by a comparison of existing specimens of each; thus Josephus (*Antt.* iii. 8. 2): Ὁ δὲ σίκλος, νόμισμα Ἑβραίων ὤν, Ἀττικὰς δέχεται δραχμὰς τέσσαρας. As the produce of the miracle was to pay for two persons, the sum required was four drachms, or a whole shekel, and the στατήρ found in the mouth of the fish, often called τετράδραχμος, is just that sum. Jerome: Siclus autem, id est stater, habet drachmas quatuor. This stater is not, of course, the gold coin more accurately so called, the τετράδραχμος χρυσοῦς, equivalent not to four, but to twenty, drachms; but the silver tretradrachm, which in later times of Greece was called a stater. That other stater, equal to the Persian daric, was worth something more than sixteen shillings of our money, this three shillings and three pence (see the *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Antt.* s. vv. Drachma and Stater; Winer, *Realwörterbuch*, s. v. Sekel; and the *Dict. of the Bible*, art. *Money*, vol. ii. p. 409). It is curious that Theophylact should be ignorant of what this stater is. Some think it, he says, a precious stone found in Syria.

[2] So Dathe and Keil; Michaëlis (*Mos. Recht*, vol. iii. p. 202) questions or denies it.

32). This might suggest a misgiving whether the same contribution is there intended; as they would scarcely have ventured to alter the amount of a divinely instituted payment. Yet the fact that the collection was yearly, and expressly for the service of God's house, will not allow us to suppose it any other; and the Children of the Captivity may have found in their present poverty and distress a plea for the diminution of the charge. It was an annual payment in the time of Josephus.[1] Philo attests the conscientious and ungrudging accuracy with which it was paid by the Jews of the Dispersion, so that in almost every city of the Roman Empire, and in cities too beyond, there was a sacred chest for the receipt of these dues: the sum of which at stated times sacred messengers were selected from among the worthiest to bear to Jerusalem.[2] It was Vespasian who diverted this capitation tax, or temple rate, into the imperial fisc, but only after city and temple had been destroyed. I quote the distinct words of Josephus on this point, as the sole argument in favour of a *secular* or civil and not a *theocratic* payment is found in the assertion, that *before* this time, as early as Pompeius, these moneys had been withdrawn from their original destination, and made payable to the Roman exchequer. Of Vespasian Josephus writes: 'He imposed a tribute on the Jews wheresoever they lived, requiring each to pay yearly

[1] *Antt.* xviii. 9. 1. It should be paid between the 15th and 25th of the month Adar (March), that is, about the feast of the passover. Yet no secure chronological conclusions in regard to our Lord's ministry can be won from this; as, through his absence from Capernaum, the money might have been for some time due. Indeed, the feast of tabernacles was probably now at hand.

[2] *De Monarch.* ii. 3: Ἱεροπομποὶ τῶν χρημάτων ἀριστίνδην ἐπικριθέντες. The whole passage reminds one much of the collection, and the manner of the transmission, of the gifts of the faithful in Achaia to Jerusalem by the hands of Paul; cf. his *Leg. ad Cai.* § 31. We find from Cicero (*Pro Flacco*, 28), that one charge against Flaccus was that he prevented the transmission of these temple-dues to Jerusalem: Cum aurum, Judæorum nomine, quotannis ex Italiâ et ex omnibus vestris provinciis Hierosolymam exportari soleret, Flaccus sanxit edicto, ne ex Asiâ exportari liceret.

two drachms to the Capitol, as before they were wont to pay them to the temple at Jerusalem.'[1] But of Pompeius he merely affirms, that 'he made Jerusalem tributary to the Romans,'[2] with no mention of this tax at all. We have already had abundant evidence that long after his time it continued to be rendered to the temple. Titus refers to this fact, when, upbraiding the Jews with the unprovoked character of their revolt, he reminds the revolters that the Romans had permitted them to collect their own sacred imposts.[3]

We note further that it is not publicans who demand this money, as the collectors would certainly have been called, had this been an ordinary tax. As little is the tone of the demand, '*Doth not your Master pay the half-shekel?*' that of a rude Roman tax-gatherer, who had detected a Jew in the act of evading, as he supposed, the tax; but is exactly what we might expect, where the duty was one of imperfect obligation, which if any declined, the payment could scarcely have been enforced.[4] To Chrysostom, indeed, the question sounds a rude one: 'Does your Master count Himself exempt from the payment of the ordinary dues? We know the freedom which He claims; does He propose to claim and exercise it here?' It is, as Theophylact suggests, more probably the reverse. Having seen or heard of the wonderful works which Christ did, they may have been uncertain in what light to regard Him. In this uncertainty they may have suffered Him to pass by them unchallenged; and it is only to his disciple,

[1] *B. J.* vii. 6. 6; cf. Dio Cassius, 66. 7.

[2] *Antt.* xiv. 4. 4: Τὰ μὲν Ἱεροσόλυμα ὑποτελῆ φόρου Ῥωμαίοις ἐποίησεν.

[3] Δασμολογεῖν ὑμῖν ἐπὶ τῷ Θεῷ ἐπιτρέψαμεν.

[4] Kuinoel (in loc.), one of the right interpreters of this incident, observes this: Exactores Romani acerbius haud dubie exegissent tributum Cæsari solvendum. And in the Rabbinical treatise especially relating to the manner of collecting these dues, it is said: Placide a quovis semisiclum expetierunt. And again: Decimo quinto [mensis Adar] sederunt trapezitæ in unâ quâque civitate, pacate nummum hunc exigentes. A dante receperunt; non dantem non compulerunt.

who had lingered, as it would seem, a little behind, that they put their question directly.

Peter, zealous for his Master's honour, sure that his piety will make Him prompt to render to God the things that are God's, aware that no poverty would excuse Him, for the very beggar was to sell his garment, rather than leave this due unpaid, pledges Him without hesitation to the payment: '*he saith, Yes.*' Certainly Peter was over-hasty here. Not in this spirit had he exclaimed a little while before, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God' (Matt. xvi. 16). For the time at least he had lost sight of his Lord's true position and prerogative, that He was a Son over his own house, and not a servant in another's; the Head of the theocracy, not one of its sub-ordinate members,—so that it was *to Him* in his Father that offerings were to be made, not *from Him* to be received.[1] In his flesh the true temple was set up, which the Lord had pitched, and not men (John ii. 21; Heb. x. 20). It was not for Him, in whom the Shechinah glory dwelt, to pay dues for the support of that other temple built with hands, whose glory was vanishing away. He who should give Himself a ransom for all other souls could not properly pay a ransom for his own; and it seriously obscured the true relation between Him and all other men that He should even seem to admit the payment of it as an obligation lying upon Him. Willing therefore to bring back Peter, and in him the other disciples, to the true recognition of Himself, from which they had in part fallen, the Lord puts to him the question which follows. With the same intention, being thus engaged through Peter's hasty

[1] Ambrose (*Ep.* vii. *ad Justum*, 12): Hoc est igitur didrachma, quod exigebatur secundum legem: sed non debebat illud filius regis, sed alienus. Quid enim se Christus redimeret ab hoc mundo, qui venerat ut tolleret peccatum mundi? Quid se a peccato redimeret, qui descenderat, ut omnibus peccatum dimitteret? . . . Quid se redimeret a morte, qui carnem susceperat, ut morte suâ omnibus resurrectionem adquireret? Cf. *Enarr. in Ps.* xlviii. 14.

imprudence to the rendering of the half-shekel, He yet does it by a miracle which should testify that all things served Him, from the greatest to the least,—that He was Lord over nature, and, having nothing, yet, in his Father's care for him, was possessed of all things,[1] his poverty only another form of his riches. For here, as so often in the life of our Lord, the depths of his humiliation are lighted up by a gleam of his glory; He pays, but in the manner of his payment re-asserts the true dignity of his person, which might else have been compromised in the eyes of some. The miracle, then, is no playful exhibition of power. It meets a real need—outwardly a slight one, for the money could assuredly have been in some other and more ordinary way procured; but as an inner need, most real: in this, then, essentially differing from the apocryphal miracles, which are so often mere sports and freaks of power, with no ethical motive or purpose whatever.

We may trace the same purpose throughout. The Lord does not wait for Peter to inform Him what he had

[1] Djeleladdin's grand poem (see Tholuck, *Blüthensamm. aus der Morgenl. Myst.* p. 148) tells exactly the same story, namely, that all nature waits on the friend of God, so that all things are his, and his seeming poverty is but another side of his true riches; only that what there is but in idea, is here clothed in the flesh and blood of an actual fact. I can give but a most inadequate extract from the German translation:

Adham Ibrahim sass einst am Meeresstrand,
Nähte dort als Bettler sich sein Mönchgewand.
Plötzlich tritt ein Emir mit Gefolg' ihn an,
Der vormals dem Seelenkönig unterthan,
Küsst den Fuss ihm, und wird alsobald verwirrt,
Da den Scheich er in der Kutt' ansichtig wird.
Den, dem einst gehorcht' ein weites Landgebiet,
Staunend er jetzt seine Kutte nähen sieht.

* * *

Drauf der Scheich die Nadel plötzlich wirft in's Meer,
Ruft dann laut: Ihr Fische, bringt die Nadel her!
Alsbald ragen hunderttausend Köpf' hervor,
Jeder Fisch bringt eine goldne Nadel vor.
Nun der Scheich mit Ernst sich zu dem Emir kehrt,
Wunderst du dich noch, dass ich die Kutt' begehrt?

answered, and to what engaged Him; but '*when he was come into the house, Jesus prevented him*,' or '*spake first to him*' (so the R. V.), anticipating his communication, showing Himself a discerner of the thoughts of the heart, and, though not having been present, perfectly aware of all which had passed.[1] '*What thinkest thou, Simon? Of whom do the kings of the earth*' (with an emphasis on the last words, for there is a silent contrasting of these, 'the princes of the Gentiles' (Matt. xx. 25), with the King of heaven, as at Ps. ii. 2), '*take custom or tribute?*[2] *of their own children, or of strangers?*'[3] On what principle had he made that engagement? was not all the analogy of things earthly against it? These earthly things, it is true, cannot *prove* the heavenly, yet are they shadows of the true, and divinely appointed helps for the better understanding of them. When Peter confesses that such kings of the earth take tribute not of their own children, but '*of strangers*,' then at once He brings him to the conclusion whither He was leading him, namely that '*the children*,' or, as it would have been better rendered, '*the sons*,' were '*free*.'[4]

[1] Jerome: Antequam Petrus suggeret, Dominus interrogat, ne scandalizentur discipuli ad postulationem tributi, quum videant eum nósse quæ absente se gesta sunt.

[2] Κῆνσος, the capitation-tax; τέλη, customs or tolls on goods.

[3] It is not easy to translate ἀλλοτρίων here. It is not so strong as our '*strangers*,' or as the *alieni* of the Vulgate, or as Luther's, von Fremden. It means no more than those that stand not in the immediate relation of υἱοί to the king (qui non pertinent ad familiam regis: Kuinoel); 'of other folk' (Hammond); von andern Leuten (De Wette). Compare for this use of ἀλλότριος, Ecclus. xl. 29, LXX. Gfrörer (*Die Heil. Sage*, vol. ii. p. 56), stumbling at the whole story, finds fault with this interpretation, because, forsooth, the Jews were not ἀλλότριοι,—as though they were not so in comparison with Christ; and, again, because they too were υἱοὶ Θεοῦ,—as though they were so in any such sense as He was. For him and for all like him, to whom there is nothing in Christ different from another man, the narrative does, in his own words, 'suffer under incurable difficulties.'

[4] With a play on the words, which is probably much more than a mere play, and rests upon a true etymology, so witnessing for the very truth which Christ is asserting here, we might say in Latin, Liberi sunt

We have here proof absolute, if further proof were needed, that what was here demanded of the Lord was God's money, to be rendered to God, and not Cæsar's, to be rendered to Cæsar; seeing that only on this assumption could He have claimed immunity for Himself, as He does in those words, '*Then are the children free*;' or '*Surely then the sons are free*.' But with a payment owing to Cæsar it would have been quite a different thing. Christ was no son of Cæsar. The fact that the sons are free would have involved no exemption for Him. He might, indeed, have asserted his freedom on other grounds; though this He would not, since He had come submitting Himself during his earthly life to every ordinance of man. It is idle to appeal to his royal Davidical descent, as that in right of which He challenges this freedom. Christ would then argue that, being one King's Son, He therefore was exempted from the tribute owing to another king, and that other, one of an alien and adverse dynasty,—in itself an argument most futile, and certainly not that of the sacred text.[1]

The plural here, '*the sons*,' rather than a singular, '*the son*,' has perplexed some, who have asked, How could the Lord thus speak, if indeed He had Himself alone, as the only-begotten Son of God, in view? The explanation is easy. In making a general statement of the worldly relations from which He borrows his analogy, and by which He assists the understanding of his disciples, as there are many '*kings of the earth*,' or as one king might have many sons, He naturally throws his speech into a plural form; and it is just as natural, when we come to the heavenly

liberi (see Freund, *Lat. Wörterbuch*, s. v. liber); these very words occurring in the noble Easter hymn beginning,

Cedant justi signa luctûs.

[1] Augustine indeed (*Quæst. Evang.* i. qu. 23) helps it out in another way: In omni regno terreno intelligendum est liberos esse regni filios. . . . Multo ergo magis liberi esse debent in quolibet regno terreno filii regni illius, sub quo sunt omnia regna terrena.

order of things which is there shadowed forth, to restrain it to the singular, to the only Son; seeing that to the King of heaven there is but One, the only-begotten of the Father.[1] But if the plural here need cause us no misgiving, as little can there be drawn from it the conclusion, that the Lord intended to include in this liberty not Himself only, but all his people, all that in this secondary sense are 'sons of God.'[2] This plainly is not true concerning dues owing to God; none are so bound to render them as his '*sons*.' Were the payment in question a civil one, it would be equally untrue; such an interpretation might be welcome to Anabaptists;[3] while some extreme Roman canonists may have found here an argument for the exemption of the clergy from payments to the State, although others justly remark that the words, if they include any of the faithful, must include all.[4] Not thus, not as one of many, not as the eldest among many brethren, but as the true and only Son of God, He challenges this

[1] Grotius: Plurali numero utitur, non quod ad alios eam extendat libertatem, sed quod comparatio id exigebat, sumta non ab unius sed ab omnium regum more ac consuetudine.

[2] So however Cocceius, who urges all which can be said for this application of the words: Christus ostendit nec se, qui Filius Dei est, obligari ad didrachma solvendum, *tanquam* λύτρον animæ suæ, nec suos discipulos, qui ab ipso hæreditant libertatem, et non argento redimuntur (Es. lii. 3), sed pretioso ipsius sanguine (1 Pet. i. 18, 19), et facti sunt filii Dei vivi (Hos. i. 10), amplius teneri ad servitutem figuræ. Olshausen follows him in this, and the author of an interesting article on this miracle in the *Dict. of the Bible*, s. v. Tribute.

[3] The Anabaptist conclusions which might be drawn from an abuse of the passage are met on right general grounds by Aquinas (*Sum. Theol.* 2^a $2^{æ}$, 104, art. 6), though he has no very precise insight into the meaning of this history. Milton, not always a fair controversialist, is a singularly unfair one in the use which he makes of this scripture (*Defence of the People of England*, 3).

[4] Tirinus: Nam pari jure omnes justi, immo omnes Christiani exempti essent. Compare Field, *Of the Church*, b. 5. ch. 53. Michaëlis affirms that others have pushed these words to the asserting of the same liberty (*Mos. Recht*, vol. iii. p. 210); that he has himself, in travelling, seen a Pietist cheat the revenue before his eyes: who, when charged with this, pleaded in defence the words, '*Then are the children free.*' The story is, unhappily, only too welcome to him.

liberty for Himself; and 'we may observe, by the way, that the reasoning itself is a strong and convincing testimony to the proper Sonship, and in the capacity of Son to the proper relationship of Jesus Christ to the Father, which those who deny that relationship will not easily evade or impugn.'[1] There is in these words the same implicit assertion that Christ's relation to God is a different one from that of other men, which runs through the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen, in the distinction so markedly drawn between the son of the householder and his servants (Mark xii. 6): nor are there any testimonies to the dignity and the prerogatives of the Son more convincing than these, which, not contained in single isolated expressions, not lying on the surface of Scripture, are bedded deeply in it, and rather assume his preëminence than declare it. It is true that for those determined not to be convinced, there is always a loophole of escape, as from other declarations, so also from these; in the present instance, the plural '*sons*' affords, for those who seek it, the desired opportunity of evasion.

Under this protest Christ will pay the money. '*Notwithstanding, lest we should offend them, go thou to the sea, and cast an hook, and take up the fish that first cometh up;*' the fish, that is, which shall first ascend from the deeper waters to his hook; '*and when thou hast opened his mouth, thou shalt find a piece of money.*' Christ will put no stumbling-block in the way of any, but provide things honest in the sight of all. Were He now to refuse this

[1] Greswell, *Diss.* vol. ii. p. 736: so too Chrysostom. I know not whether this passage was used by the Catholics in the Arian controversy; but Hilary, a confessor and standard-bearer for the truth in that great conflict, brings out well how the Godhead of Christ is involved in this argument (*Comm. in Matt.* in loc.): Didrachma tamquam ab homine poscebatur a Christo. Sed ut ostenderet legi se non esse subjectum, *ut in se paternæ dignitatis gloriam contestaretur*, terreni privilegii posuit exemplum: censu aut tributis regum filios non teneri, potiusque se Redemtorem animæ nostræ corporisque esse quam in redemtionem sui aliquid postulandum; quia Regis Filium extra communionem oporteret esse reliquorum.

payment, it might seem to those who knew not the transcendent secret of his birth that He was affecting a false liberty,[1] was come not to fulfil the law, but to destroy it. There was indeed no need, only a decorum, in the payment; as there was no necessity for his Baptism; it was that whereto of his own choice He willingly submitted; nor yet for the Circumcision which He received in his flesh (Luke ii. 21); but He took on Himself the humiliations of the law, that He might in due time deliver from under the law.

And here is the explanation of the very significant fact that the Lord should make this payment not for Himself only, but also for Peter, the representative of all the faithful. He came under the same yoke with men, that they might enter into the same freedom with Him.[2] '*That take,*[3] *and give unto them for Me and thee.*'[4] Capernaum

[1] Chrysostom (*Hom.* lxiv. *in Joh.*) gives to these words, '*Lest we should offend them,*' another turn—lest, when this secret of our heavenly birth, and our consequent exemption from tribute, is told them, they should be unable to receive it; and we should thus have put a stumbling-block in their path, revealing to them mysteries which at this present they are unable to receive.

[2] Ambrose (*Ep.* vii. *ad Justum*, 18): Ideo didrachmum solvi jubet pro se et Petro, quia uterque sub lege generati. Jubet ergo secundum legem solvi, ut eos qui sub lege erant redimeret. And Augustine, upon Ps. cxxxvii. 8: Domine, retribues pro me, adduces this history: Nihil debebat: pro se non reddidit, sed pro nobis reddidit: and again (*Serm.* clv. 7): Mysterium latebat: Christus tamen tributum non debitum persolvebat. Sic persolvit et mortem; non debebat, et persolvebat. Ille nisi indebitum solveret, nunquam nos a debito liberaret. Jerome (in loc.): Ut ostenderetur similitudo carnis, dum eodem et servus et Dominus pretio liberantur.

[3] Moule (*Heraldry of Fish*) gives the natural mythology connected with this miracle: 'A popular idea assigns the dark marks on the shoulders of the haddock to the impression left by St. Peter with his finger and thumb, when he took the tribute-money out of the fish's mouth at Capernaum; but the haddock certainly does not now exist in the seas of the country where the miracle was performed. . . . The dory, called St. Peter's fish in several countries of Europe, contends with the haddock the honour of bearing the marks of the Apostle's fingers, an impression transmitted to posterity as a perpetual memorial of the miracle. The name of the dory is hence asserted to be derived from the French *adoré*, worshipped.'

[4] In this ἀντὶ ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ (cf. Matt. xx. 28; and Winer, *Gramm.* § 51, 5 a) lies another proof that we have here a ransom *for* persons, a

was the place of Peter's domicile (Matt. viii. 5, 14) as well as the Lord's; the place therefore where his half-shekel, no less than the Lord's, would be due. Christ says not 'for *us*,' but '*for Me and thee*;' as elsewhere, 'I ascend unto *my* Father and *your* Father, and to *my* God, and *your* God' (John xx. 17); for, even while He makes common part with his brethren, He yet does this by the condescension of grace, not by a necessity of nature; and it greatly concerns them that they should understand this; and at no time lose sight of the fact that here was a delivered and a Deliverer, a ransomed and a Ransomer, however to the natural eye there may have seemed two who are ransomed alike. And, as on other occasions, at his Presentation in the temple (Luke ii. 22–24), and again at his Baptism (Matt. iii. 16, 17), there was something more than common which should hinder a misunderstanding of that which was done; at the Presentation, in Simeon's song and Anna's thanksgiving; at the Baptism, first in John's reluctance to baptize Him, and then in the opened heaven and the voice from thence (Matt. iii. 15);—so also is there here a protest of Christ's immunity from the present payment, first in his own declaration, '*Then are the children free*;' and next in the notable device by which He meets the necessity which Peter has so heedlessly created for Him.[1]

It is remarkable, and is a solitary instance of the kind, that the issue of this bidding is not told us. We are meant beyond doubt to understand that Peter went to the neighbouring lake, cast in his hook, and in the throat of

price given *in their stead*, with a reference to the original institution of this payment, the half-shekels being accounted as λύτρα τῆς ψυχῆς (Exod. xxx. 12); and so another argument, if that were needed, for the truth of our interpretation.

[1] Bengel: In medio actu submissionis emicat majestas. And Clarius: Reddit ergo censum, sed ex ore piscis acceptum, ut agnoscatur majestas. So too Origen (in loc.) recognizes a saving of the Lord's dignity in the mode of the payment, a saving, of course, not for his own sake, but for ours. In other cases where misapprehension was possible, we find a like care for this (John xi. 41, 42).

the first fish that rose to it, found, according to his Lord's word, the coin that was needed. As little here as at Luke v. 4, 6, did the miraculous in the miracle consist in a mere foreknowledge on the Lord's part that this first fish should yield the stater which was needed : He did not merely foreknow; but by the mysterious potency of his will which ran through all nature, drew such a fish to that spot at that moment, and ordained that it should swallow the hook. We see here as at Jonah i. 17 ('the Lord *had prepared* a great fish to swallow up Jonah'), that in the lower spheres of creaturely life there is unconscious obedience to Him; that these also are not *out* of God, but move *in* Him, and are without knowing it, for grace or for judgment, the active ministers of his will (1 Kin. xiii. 24; xvii. 6; xx. 36; 2 Kin. xvii. 25; Job v. 22, 23; Jer. v. 6; Ezek. xiv. 15; Amos ix. 3).

All attempts to exhaust this miracle of its miraculous element, to make the Evangelist tell, and intend to tell, an ordinary transaction, as that of the rationalist Paulus, who will have it that the Lord bade Peter go and catch as many fish as would sell for the required sum, and maintains that this actually lies in the words,[1]—are hopelessly

[1] His honesty and his Greek keep admirable company. Πρῶτον ἰχθύν he takes collectively, primum quemque piscem, ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ solvens eum ab hamo, εὑρήσεις στατῆρα vendendo piscem statera tibi comparabis. This is not even new; for see Köcher, *Analecta*, 1766, in loc.: Piscem capies quem pro statere vendere poteris. In a later work, Paulus amends his plea, and ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα is no longer, opening the fish's mouth to take out the hook, but, opening thine own mouth, *i.e.* crying the fish for sale, αὐτοῦ εὑρήσεις στατῆρα, thou wilt there earn a stater. Another of the same school (see Kuinoel, in loc.) will have the whole speech a playful irony on the Lord's part, who would show Peter the impossible payment to which he has pledged Him, when money they had none in their purse; as though He had said, 'The next thing which you had better do is to go and catch us a fish, and draw from its mouth the coin which shall pay this tax to which you have engaged us.' It was reserved for the mythic school of interpreters to find other difficulties here, besides the fundamental one of there being a miracle at all. 'How,' exclaims Strauss, and Keim (*Jesu von Nazara*, vol. ii. p. 603) condescends to repeat the objection, 'could the fish retain the stater in its mouth? the coin must needs have dropped out while it was opening its jaws to swallow the hook;

absurd. In an opposite extreme, they multiply miracles without a warrant who assume that the stater was *created* for the occasion;[1] nay more, they step altogether out of the proper sphere of miracle; in which, as distinguished from the act of pure creation, there is always a nature-basis to which the divine power that works the wonder more or less closely links itself. That divine power which dwelt in Christ, restored, as in the case of the sick, the halt, the blind; it multiplied, as the bread in the wilderness; it changed into a nobler substance, as the water at Cana; it quickened and revived, as Lazarus and the daughter of Jairus; it brought together, as here, by wonderful coincidences, the already existing; but, as far as our records reach, it formed no new limbs; it made no bread, no wine, out of nothing; it created no new men: never passed over on any one occasion into the region of absolute creation.[2]

The allegorical interpretations, or rather uses, of this miracle, for they are seldom intended for more, have not

and, moreover, it is not in the *mouths*, but in the *bellies*, of fishes that precious things are found.' Did Juvencus, by the way, anticipate and seek to evade this difficulty, when, turning the Gospels into hexameters, he wrote: Hujus pandantur *scissi penetralia ventris*? Such is the objection against which this history is too weak to stand! It can only be matched with the objection which another makes to the historic truth of Daniel in the lions' den; namely, that if a stone was laid at the mouth of the den (Dan. vi. 17), the lions must needs have been suffocated,—nothing satisfying him but that the mouth of the den must have been hermetically sealed!

[1] So does Seb. Schmidt (*Fascic. Diss.* p. 796). Chrysostom (*Hom.* lxxxvii. *in Joh.*) accounts in like manner for the fish which the disciples find ready upon the shore (John xxi. 9); and some will have that Christ not merely gave sight to, but made organs of vision for, the man who was born blind (John ix.).

[2] The accounts are numerous of precious things found in the bellies of fishes. The story of Polycrates' ring is well known (Herodotus, iii. 42); and in Jewish legend Solomon, having lost his ring of power, recovers it in the same unexpected way (Eisenmenger, *Entdeckt. Judenth.* vol. i. p. 360). Augustine (*De Civ. Dei*, xxii. 8) records a like incident in his own day, in which he sees a providential dealing of God, answering the prayer, and supplying the need, of one of his servants.

much to attract; neither that of Clement of Alexandria,[1] that each skilful 'fisher of men' will, like Peter, remove the coin of pride and avarice and luxury from the mouth of them whom he has drawn up by the hook of the Gospel from the waste waters of the world; nor yet that which St. Ambrose brings forward, wherein the stater plays altogether a different, indeed an opposite, part;[2] nor has Augustine's mystical interpretation more to draw forth our assent.[3] It is superfluous to press further a miracle already so rich in teaching as this has approved itself to be.

[1] *Pædag.* ii. vol. i. p. 172, Potter's ed.; cf. Origen, *Comm. in Matt.* for the same.

[2] *Hexaëm.* v. 6: Ideo misit retia, et complexus est Stephanum, qui de Evangelio primus ascendit [τὸν ἀναβάντα πρῶτον] habens in ore suo staterem justitiæ. Unde confessione constanti clamavit, dicens: Ecce video cælos apertos, et Filium hominis stantem ad dexteram Dei. So Hilary, *Comm. in Matt.* in loc.

[3] *Enarr. in Ps.* cxxxvii. 8: Primum surgentem de mari, primogenitum a mortuis; for by Him, he says, with the error which runs through his whole interpretation, ab exactione *hujus seculi* liberamur.

29. *THE RAISING OF LAZARUS.*

John xi. 1–54.

IT is a remarkable statement which St. John makes at the close of the twentieth chapter of his Gospel: 'And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God' (ver. 30, 31; cf. xxi. 35). He has indeed shown a noteworthy restraint, even a parsimony, in the number of miracles which he has actually recorded. He has in no instance more than one miracle of the same kind; thus one healing of the lame (v. 9), one opening of blind eyes (ix. 7), one raising from the dead, namely this of Lazarus; and, as wrought by the Lord in the days of his flesh, only seven miracles in all—these seven again dividing themselves into two groups, of four and of three; four wrought in Galilee, and three in Judæa. When we call to mind the frequent grouping by seven both in his Gospel and in the Apocalypse, we can hardly account this number accidental. We have now reached the last of this seven; it is not for nothing that it is thus the last, occupying the place which it does just at the close of Christ's ministry on earth. He who was Himself so soon to taste of death will show Himself by this infallible proof the Lord of life and conqueror of death; who, redeeming the soul of another from the grave, would assuredly not lack the power to redeem his own from the same.

It must always remain a mystery why this miracle, transcending as it does all others which the Lord wrought,

so memorable in itself, drawing after it consequences so immense (John xi. 53), should have been passed over by the three earlier Evangelists, and left for the latest to record. The utmost that can be hoped is to suggest some probable explanation.[1] Thus, some have urged, as Grotius and Olshausen, that the earlier Evangelists, writing in Palestine, and while Lazarus or some of his family yet survived, would not willingly draw attention, and, it might be, persecution, upon them (see John xii. 10); while St. John, who wrote at a much later date, and not in Palestine, but in Asia Minor, had no such motive for keeping this miracle out of sight. The omission on their part, and the mention upon his, will then correspond to a like omission and mention of the name of the disciple who smote off the ear of the High Priest's servant, St. John alone recording that it was Peter who struck the blow (xviii. 10). But how unsatisfying an explanation is this! It would account at the utmost for the silence of St. Matthew; not for St. Mark's, whose Gospel was probably written at Rome; for St. Luke's as little, who wrote for his friend Theophilus, whom many intimations make us conclude to have lived in Italy. And the danger itself, how hard it is to imagine that this should actually have existed! There may have been, we know there was, such at the first moment; but how much must have altered since, what new objects of hostility arisen: not to say that if there *was* danger, and such as a mention of this miracle wrought on him would enhance, yet Lazarus would as little himself have shrunk, as those who

[1] Hengstenberg reminds us of similar phenomena in the relation between the Books of Kings and of Chronicles. The former, not to speak of other omissions, passes over altogether the great confederacy of the desert tribes in the times of King Jehoshaphat, with the deliverance which was divinely wrought for Judah; and it is only in the Chronicles (2 Chron. xx. 1–30), that any record of these events is to be found; and this, although nothing less than the existence of the nation was then at stake; Ps. xlvii., xlviii., lxxxiii. all testifying how profound the impression on the mind of the people which the danger, and the deliverance from the danger, had left behind it.

loved him would have desired to withdraw him, from honourable peril, incurred for Christ's sake. Neither he nor they could have desired that a work revealing so much of the glory of the Lord should remain untold, lest persecution or danger might from the telling accrue to him, or to some dear to him. Others then, as Neander, feeling the insufficiency of this explanation, have observed how the three earlier Evangelists report few miracles save those which were wrought in Galilee, leaving those of Jerusalem and its neighbourhood nearly untouched; and that so they have omitted this.[1] But this, though perfectly true, is no explanation, only a re-stating in other words of the fact which needs explanation; and the question still remains, *Why* should they have done so? and to this it is difficult to find now the satisfactory answer. That the earlier Evangelists did not know of this wondrous work cannot for an instant be supposed. One of them, St. Matthew, was an eye-witness of it, no less than St. John; two of them record the feast in Simon's house which grew immediately from it (Matt. xxvi. 6; Mark xiv. 3); and all of them the enthusiastic reception of the Lord as He entered Jerusalem on the day of Palms, which reception only this miracle will adequately account for.

'*Now a certain man was sick, named Lazarus, of Bethany*,[2]

[1] *Leben Jesu*, p. 357.

[2] Stanley (*Sinai and Palestine*, p. 186): '*Bethany*, a wild mountain hamlet, screened by an intervening ridge from the view of the top of Olivet, perched on its broken plateau of rock, the last collection of human habitations before the desert hills which reach to Jericho,—this is the modern village of El-Lazarieh, which derives its name from its clustering round the traditional site of the one house and grave which give it an undying interest. High in the distance are the Perean mountains; the foreground is the deep descent to the Jordan valley. On the further side of that dark abyss Martha and Mary knew that Christ was abiding when they sent their messengers; up that long ascent they had often watched his approach; up that long ascent He came when, outside the village, Martha and Mary met Him, and the Jews stood round weeping.' On the derivation of Bethany, see a letter by Dr. Deutsch in Dixon's *Holy Land*, vol. ii. p. 217.

the town of Mary and her sister Martha.' This '*Now*,'—or '*But*,' which would be preferable,—connects what follows with what just has gone before, indicates how it came to pass that the safer and more retired life of the Lord (see x. 39–42) was brought to a close, and He once more drawn into the perilous neighbourhood of that city, the head-quarters of his bitterest foes. Lazarus appears now for the first time in the Evangelical history; he is described, if we give full force to the two prepositions, as '*from* (ἀπό) *Bethany, of* (ἐκ) *the town of Mary and Martha.*' Some have urged that these two denote different facts, the first the place of his present residence, namely Bethany, the second the town or village from which he originally sprang.[1] But this is a mistake. The latter clause is added not as stating a new fact, but to exclude any misapprehension in one just stated, to make plain, *which* Bethany was intended. There were two villages of this name. In addition to the Bethany which we know so well, there was another 'beyond Jordan;' for 'Bethany' or 'Bethania,' not 'Bethabara,' is the proper reading of John i. 28.[2] Lazarus might be unknown even by name to St. John's readers, but with Mary and Martha they were familiar. It is true that St. John has not himself named them yet; but here as everywhere (thus see iii. 24; vi. 70; xi. 2), he assumes an acquaintance on the part of his readers with the preceding Gospels, and in St. Luke's the two sisters, though not the brother, appear (x. 38–42). When therefore he designates Bethany as '*the town of Mary and*

[1] Greswell, for example, in an ingenious essay, *On the Village of Mary and Martha* (*Diss.* vol. ii. p. 545). But a change of the preposition with no change of the meaning, such as we have here, is sufficiently common in Greek; see Sophocles, *Electra*, 700, seq.; and Kühner, *Greek Gramm.* vol. ii. p. 319; see moreover John i. 45, where exactly the same use of ἀπό and ἐκ occurs, and which is quite decisive in respect of their intention here. It may, indeed, be a question whether the comma after Lazarus should not be removed, and '*Lazarus of Bethany*' (= Lazarus Bethaniensis) be read in one breath.

[2] It was so read, Origen assures us, in nearly all copies of his day; and having the authority of all the best MSS. and of most of the older Versions, has now obtained a place in our best critical editions.

her sister Martha,' he at once makes evident which Bethany he intends.

This reference, I observe by the way, goes far to make probable that the 'certain village,'[1] in which the sisters at an earlier day received the Lord, was itself Bethany (Luke x. 38–42). It is unlikely, though of course not impossible, that they should in the brief interval have changed the place of their habitation; and the only plausible argument against the identifying of that village with Bethany, namely that the little history would be then narrated out of its due order and in the midst of the Galilean ministry of the Lord, is not of much weight. In their record of events, the Evangelists continually depart from the law of mere historic succession, marshalling and grouping them according to a higher spiritual law. St. Luke had just recorded the parable of the Good Samaritan, with that 'Go and do thou likewise,' which constitutes the moral of the whole. But this active doing, he will teach us next, must never be dissociated from the inner rest of the spirit, nor degenerate into a mere bustling outward activity; and Martha as she there appears, and as she is there rebuked, is a needful warning against a misapplication of that 'Go and do,' addressed to the lawyer. One Scripture is set over against and made to balance the other. Another proof that St. John assumes the acquaintance of his readers with the preceding Gospel, we may trace in his putting, upon this his first mention of the sisters, Mary before Martha. There is much to make it probable that Mary was the younger; external probabilities, as that the house was not hers but Martha's, that Martha resents being deprived of the power to order her sister about; and internal no less, the order of grace continually going counter to the order of nature, God reversing the prerogatives of the flesh (1 Cor. i. 26–29); as in Isaac

[1] Κώμη there as here, though translated there 'village,' and here 'town.'

(Gen. xxi. 12); in Jacob (Gen. xxv. 34); in Joseph (Gen. xlii. 6), and in David (1 Sam. xvi. 11), was eminently shown; and not improbably in Mary. But the Evangelist having claimed for her this once her place of higher precedence, as the elder by spiritual birth, she falls back in his narrative into her natural as distinguished from her spiritual place, and is henceforward named not before, but after her sister (ver. 5, 19).

What the exact constitution of the household of Bethany may have been, it is impossible to say, the Gospels being singularly sparing in circumstantial notices concerning the persons they introduce, only relating so much as is absolutely necessary to make their part in the divine story intelligible. Perhaps Martha was an early widow, with whom Mary and a younger brother, Lazarus, dwelt; Hengstenberg, rejecting this supposition, sees in her the wife of Simon—at whose house (see Matt. xxvi. 6) the feast recorded in the next chapter was made—and has a most elaborate discussion for the purpose of proving this, and that the anointing of our Lord at a meal took place only once; that this Simon, therefore, is identical with Simon the Pharisee (Luke vii. 36–53), and Mary that sat at Jesus' feet and heard his word with the 'woman that was a sinner.' One had hoped that the medieval identification of these latter two had been definitively set aside; but recent experience has shown that there is no question in the interpretation of Scripture from the smallest to the greatest which may not be opened anew. It would lead too far astray from my purpose to follow his arguments; I must content myself with saying that the little romance to the construction of which he has devoted some six and twenty pages is to my mind a marvel of wasted ingenuity. I pass on to the miracle before us. '*It was that Mary*,' the Evangelist proceeds to say, '*which anointed the Lord with ointment, and wiped his feet with her hair, whose brother Lazarus was sick.*' He

will distinguish her by that notable deed of hers from all the other Maries of the Evangelical history; even as with his commemoration of the deed the fulfilment of Matt. xxvi. 13 begins. As he has not thus far himself recorded that anointing, however he may do so when the fit time shall arrive (xii. 2–8), here too he assumes a familiarity on the part of his readers with those two earlier Gospels in which that story is related at length (Matt. xxvi. 6; Mark xiv. 3).

'*Therefore his sisters sent unto Him, saying, Lord, behold, he whom Thou lovest is sick.*' We know not how often the Lord had honoured that house at Bethany with his presence. One memorable occasion, with its word of warning love, had occurred already (Luke x. 41, 42); and when later than this, during the Great Week, He lodged, as we are told, in Bethany (Matt. xxi. 17; Mark xi. 11, 19), returning thither for the night after the day's task in the hostile city was over, and again repairing with the early morning to Jerusalem, He can scarcely have graced with his presence any other roof but this. Now therefore, when there is sorrow there, the sisters turn in their need to Him, whom they may have themselves already proved an effectual helper in the day of trouble, who at any rate has shown Himself such in the worst necessities of others. He is at a distance, beyond Jordan; having withdrawn thither from the malice of his adversaries (John x. 39, 40; cf. i. 28); but the place of his retirement is known to the friendly household, and their messenger finds his way to Him with the tidings of danger and distress. Very beautiful is their confidence in Him; they speak no word urging Him to come, and to come quickly; they only state their need. This, they take for granted, will be sufficient; for He does not love and forsake them whom He loves.[1] It is

[1] Augustine (*In Ev. Joh. tract.* xl.): Non dixerunt, Veni. Amanti enim tantummodo nuntiandum fuit. . . . Sufficit ut noveris; non enim amas et deseris.

but a day's journey from the one Bethany to the other; they may securely count that help will not tarry long.

'*When Jesus heard that, He said, This sickness is not unto death,*[1] *but for the glory of God, that the Son of God might be glorified thereby.*' This saying, addressed to the messenger, is for him to carry back to them who sent him, is indeed spoken to them (see ver. 40, where Christ with his, '*Said I not unto thee,*' refers Martha to these very words). They are purposely enigmatical, and must have sorely tried the faith of the sisters. By the time that the messenger brought them back, Lazarus was already dead. Greatly therefore must this confident assurance of a happier issue have perplexed them. Had their heavenly Friend deceived them? or had He been Himself deceived? Why had He not excluded all room for mischance by Himself coming; or, if aught had hindered this, by speaking that word which, far off as near, was effectual to heal; which He had thus spoken for others, for those that were wellnigh strangers to Him, and had healed them? (Matt. viii. 13; John iv. 50). But, as with so many other of the divine promises, which seem to us for the moment to have utterly failed, and this because we so little dream of the resources of the divine love and the divine power, and are ever putting human limitations on these, so was it with this word,—a perplexing riddle, till the event made it plain. Even now, in the eyes of Him who saw the end from the beginning, that sickness was '*not unto death*;' and this they too should acknowledge, when through the grave and gate of death their brother should enter on a higher life than any which hitherto he had known. For this we may confidently assume, that it *was* a higher life than any which he had before lived to which Lazarus was recalled. That sickness of his was '*for the glory of God*;' in which '*glory*' was included the perfecting of his own

[1] Πρὸς θάνατον = θανάσιμος, 1 John v. 16; cf. 1 Kin. xvii. 17; 2 Kin. xx. 1 (LXX), where of Hezekiah it is said, ἠῤῥώστησεν εἰς θάνατον.

spiritual being, as no doubt it *was* perfected through this wondrous crisis of his life. But all this, which was so much for him, was also a signal moment in the gradual revelation of the glory of Christ to the Church and to the world. The Son of God was first glorified *in* Lazarus, and then *on* and *through* him to the world; compare the exact parallel, John ix. 2, 3.

Some connect what follows, '*Now Jesus loved*[1] *Martha, and her sister, and Lazarus*,' with what went before, and find in these words an explanation of the message, and of the confidence which the sisters entertain in the Lord's help; some with the verse which follows, and understand St. John to be bringing into strongest contrast the Lord's love to the distressed family at Bethany, and his tarrying notwithstanding for two days where He was, and this even after their cry of distress had reached Him; to be suggesting to the thoughtful reader all that is involved in a love which waited so long, before it stepped in to save. But this verse is better connected not with *one*, but with *two* which follow. St. John would say: Jesus loved Martha and the others; '*when He had heard therefore that he was sick, He abode two days still in the same place where He was; then after that, saith He to his disciples, Let us go into Judæa again*,' as one who could not endure to remain longer away from those so loved, and so urgently needing his presence.[2] To conceive any other reason for his tarrying where He

[1] Ἠγάπα here; but φιλεῖς, ver. 3. This last word might well be used in regard of Christ's love to the brother; but it would have been contrary to the fine decorum of the language of Scripture to use it now that the sisters are included in his love. Not till after the Ascension did the restraints which limited the relations even of the Son of man to women altogether fall away. He checked Mary Magdalene, when she would have anticipated the time (John xx. 17). On the difference between the two words I have entered more fully, *Synonyms of the New Testament*, § 12.

[2] Maldonatus: Credo rationem tacite reddere [Evangelistam] cur etsi non statim ierit, postea tamen ierit suo tempore, quasi dicat, non potuisse illorum, quos tantopere diligebat, oblivisci, fixum in ejus animo mansisse nuntium ægritudinis Lazari.

was during those two days, than that He might have scope for that great miracle, as, for example, that He had in hand some important work for the kingdom of God where He was, such as would not endure interruption, and might not be forsaken for the most urgent calls of private friendship, is extremely unnatural (see x. 41, 42). Had it been '*for the glory of God*,' He who could have sent his word and healed (Matt. viii. 13; xv. 28; John iv. 50), would not have failed so to do. This tarrying was rather a part of the severe yet gracious discipline of divine love. The need must attain to the highest, before He interferes. It is often thus. He intervenes with mighty help, but not till every other help, not until, to the weak faith of man, even his own promise seems utterly to have failed.

This mention of Judæa brings out the danger more vividly than Bethany of itself would have done. The wondering and trembling disciples remonstrate: '*Master, the Jews of late sought to stone Thee*' (see x. 31, 39), '*and goest Thou thither again?*' The necessity of hiding from their malice had brought Him to those safer haunts beyond Jordan, and will He now affront that danger anew? In these remonstrances of theirs there spake out a true love to their Master; but mingled with this love apprehensions for their own safety, as is presently made plain by the words of Thomas (ver. 16), who takes it for granted that to return with Him is to die with Him. To keep this in mind, will help us to understand the answer of the Lord: '*Are there not twelve hours in the day?*' or, rather, '*Are not the hours of the day twelve?*' And then He proceeds: '*If any man walk in the day, he stumbleth not, because he seeth the light of this world.*' This saying of his we may paraphrase thus: 'Is there not a time, which is not cut short or abridged by premature darkness, but consists of twelve full hours,[1] during any part of which a

[1] Maldonatus: Certum esse atque statum spatium diei, *quod minui non possit*; duodecim enim constare horis; intra id spatium si quis am-

man may walk and work without stumbling,—for such stumbling is quite exceptional then (Isai. lix. 10; Hos. iv. 5),—being enlightened by the light of this world (Gen. i. 15, 16), by the natural sun in the heavens? Such an unconcluded day there is now for Me, a day during any part of which I can safely accomplish the work given Me by my Father, whose light I, in like manner, behold.[1] So long as the day, the time appointed by my Father for my earthly walk, endures, so long as there is any work for Me still to accomplish, I am safe, and you are safe in my company.' Compare similar words spoken under similar circumstances of danger, John ix. 4. And then, leaving all allusion to Himself, and contemplating his disciples alone, He links another thought to this, and warns them that they never walk otherwise than as seeing Him who is the Light of men,—that they undertake no task, and affront no danger, unless looking to Him, who can alone make their darkness to be light; '*but if a man walk in the night, he stumbleth, because there is no light in him.*' In these last words there is a forsaking of the figure, which would have required something of this kind, 'because there is no light *above* him;' but in the spiritual world it is one and the same thing not to see the light above us, and not to have it in us; they only having it in them, who see it above them (cf. xii. 35; 1 John ii. 8–11).

'*These things said He: and after that He saith unto them, Our friend*[2] *Lazarus sleepeth; but I go, that I may awake him out of sleep.*' We must not explain this announcement

bulat, sine periculo ambulare. Calvin: Vocatio Dei instar lucis diurnæ est, quæ nos errare vel impingere non patitur. Quisquis ergo Dei verbo obtemperat, nec quidquam aggreditur nisi ejus jussu, illum quoque habere cælo ducem et directorem, et hâc fiduciâ secure et intrepide viam arripere potest. Cf. Ps. xc. 11. Grotius: Quanto ergo magis tuto ambulo, qui prælucentem mihi habeo lucem supracælestem, ac divinam cognitionem Paterni propositi.

[1] Bengel: Jam multa erat hora, sed tamen adhuc erat dies.

[2] Bengel, on the words ὁ φίλος ἡμῶν: Quantâ humanitate Jesus amicitiam suam cum discipulis communicat.

by supposing the Lord to have received newer and later tidings from the house of sickness, informing Him that it is now the house of death; but rather by the inner power of his spirit He knows how it has fared with his friend. In language how simple does He speak of the mighty work which He is about to accomplish; such as shall rather extenuate than enhance its greatness: Lazarus has fallen asleep, and needs to be awakened. '*Then said his disciples, Lord, if he sleep, he shall do well*;' for, as the Evangelist informs us, '*they thought that He had spoken of taking of rest in sleep.*' This often marks the favourable crisis in sickness; and they, eagerly seizing upon any plea for not returning as into the jaws of destruction, take for granted that it does so here.[1] What need that their beloved Lord should expose Himself and them to uttermost peril, when without his presence all was going well? The contemplation of death as a sleep is so common,[2] has been so taken up into the symbolism, conscious or unconscious, of all nations, that it was no difficulty in the image itself which occasioned the misunderstanding upon their part; but, his words being capable of a figurative or a literal sense, they erroneously accept them in the latter.[3] They make a similar mistake at Matt. xvi. 6–12; and probably one not very dissimilar, Luke xxii. 38; cf. Jer. xiii. 12; John iii. 4. '*Then said Jesus unto them plainly, Lazarus is dead; and I am glad for your sakes that I*

[1] Grotius: Discipuli omnimodo quærunt Dominum ab isto itinere avocare. Ideo omnibus utuntur argumentis. Calvin: Libenter hanc fugiendi periculi occasionem arripiunt.

[2] Thus in the exquisite epigram of Callimachus, x. 68:

Τῆδε Σάων ὁ Δίκωνος, Ἀκάνθιος, ἱερὸν ὕπνον
Κοιμᾶται· θνήσκειν μὴ λέγε τοὺς ἀγαθούς.

[3] Such an use of *κοιμᾶσθαι* is frequent in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament (2 Chron. xiv. 1; Isai. xiv. 8; Jer. li. 57; Job xiv. 12; Dan. xii. 2); nor less in the New (Matt. xxvii. 52; Acts vii. 60; xiii. 36; 1 Cor. vii. 39; xi. 30; xv. 6, 18, 20, 51; 1 Thess. iv. 13, 14, 15; 2 Pet. iii. 4): so *κοίμησις*, Ecclus. xlvi. 19. We have a corresponding use of *ἐξυπνίζειν*, Job xiv. 12: *Ἄνθρωπος δὲ κοιμηθεὶς οὐ μὴν ἀναστῇ ἕως ἂν ὁ οὐρανὸς οὐ μὴ συῤῥαφῇ, καὶ οὐκ ἐξυπνισθήσονται ἐξ ὕπνου αὐτῶν.*

was not there, to the intent ye may believe.' He anticipates the thought which almost of necessity must have risen up in their minds, namely, why He had not been present to save. Through that absence of his there should be a fuller revelation of the glory of God than could have been from his earlier presence; a revelation that should lead them, and in them all the Church, to loftier stages of faith, to a deeper recognition of Himself, as the Lord of life and of death. He is glad, for his disciples' sake, that it thus had befallen; for had He been upon the spot, He could not have suffered the distress of those so dear to Him to reach the highest point, but must have interfered at an earlier moment.

'*Nevertheless let us go unto him.*' From the way in which this summons is received, it is plain that for one disciple at least the anticipation of death, as the certain consequence of this perilous journey, is not removed. '*Then said Thomas, which is called Didymus, unto his fellow-disciples,*[1] *Let us also go, that we may die with Him*;' that is, with Christ; for to refer these words, as some have done, to Lazarus, is idle. Not to urge objections which lie deeper, it is sufficient to observe that the words indicate not merely fellowship *in death*, but *in dying*, which was manifestly impossible in the case of one already dead. On two other occasions Thomas is introduced with the same interpretation of his name, the same reminder on the part of the Evangelist to his Greek reader that Thomas in the Hebrew is equivalent to Didymus, that is twin or double, in the Greek (xx. 24; xxi. 2). Is there any mystery here? did St. John intend us to see any significance in this name, any coming out in the name-bearer of the qualities which the name expressed? Many, both in ancient times and in modern, have thought he did so intend; and certainly the analogy of other similar notices in this Gospel, none of which can be re-

[1] Συμμαθητής, only here in the New Testament, occurs once in Plato, *Euthyd.* 272 c.

garded as idle (i. 42; ix. 7), would lead to this conclusion. It is very possible that Thomas may have received this as a new name from his Lord, even as Simon and the sons of Zebedee certainly, and Levi very probably, received in like manner names from Him. It was a name which told him all he had to fear, and all he had to hope. In him the twins, unbelief and faith, were contending with one another for mastery, as Esau and Jacob, the old man and the new, once struggled in Rebecca's womb (Gen. xxv. 23, 24). He was, as indeed all are by nature, the double or twin-minded man.[1] It was for him to see that in and through the regeneration he obtained strength to keep the better, and to cast away the worse, half of his being. He here utters words which belong to one of the great conflicts of his life. They are words in which the old and the new, unbelief and faith, are both speaking, partly one and partly the other; and St. John very fitly bids us note that in this there was the outcoming of all which his name embodied so well.[2] For indeed in this saying of his there is a very singular blending of faith and unbelief—faith, since he counted it better to die with his Lord than to live forsaking Him,—unbelief, since he conceived it possible that so long as his Lord had a work to accomplish, He, or any under his shield, could be overtaken by a peril which should require them to die together. Thomas was evidently of a melancholic desponding complexion; most true to his Master, yet ever inclined to look at things on

[1] Ἀνὴρ δίψυχος, Jam. i. 8; cf. iv. 8; compare Horace (*Carm.* i. 6. 7): *Duplex* Ulysses.

[2] All this has been excellently brought out by Hengstenberg (in loc.). He has, however, as is observed above, forerunners here. Thus Theophylact accounts for St. John's interpretation of the name of Thomas, that he wished to indicate the congruity between the man and his name (ἵνα δείξῃ ὑμῖν ὅτι διστακτικός τις ἦν). And Lampe: Nomen Thomæ significativum fuisse, facile mihi persuaserim. Idque eo magis, quia nulla alias suppetit ratio tertiâ vice ab Evangelistâ nostro repetiti hujus nominis interpretamenti, nisi sublimius aliquid hîc lateret. He then refers, but doubtfully, to that passage, namely Gen. xxv. 24–26, in which the key to the explanation of the name must be found.

their darker side, finding it most hard to raise himself to the loftier elevations of faith,—to believe other and more than he saw,[1] or to anticipate more favourable issues than those which the merely human probabilities of an event portended.[2] Men of all temperaments and all characters were to be found in that first and nearest circle of disciples, that so there might be the representatives and helpers of all who hereafter, through struggles of one kind or struggles of another, should attain at last to the full assurance of faith. Very beautifully Chrysostom[3] says of this disciple, that he who now would hardly venture to go *with* Jesus as far as to the neighbouring Bethany, afterwards *without* Him, without, that is, his bodily presence, travelled to the ends of the world, to the furthest India, affronting all the perils of remote and hostile nations.

Martha and Mary would have hardly ventured to claim help from the Lord, till the sickness of their brother had assumed an alarming character. Lazarus probably died upon the same day that the messenger announcing his illness had reached the Lord; otherwise it could scarcely have been said that '*when Jesus came, He found that he had lain in the grave four days already.*' The day of the messenger's arrival on this calculation would be one day; two other our Lord abode in Peræa after He had received the message; and one more,—for it was but the journey of a single day,—He would employ in the journey to Bethany. Dying upon that day, Lazarus, according to the custom

[1] Godet: Le Thomas qui parle ainsi est bien celui que nous retrouverons dans xix. 5; xx. 25. Cette conséquence, nullement calculée, dans le rôle des personnages secondaires est l'un des traits les plus frappants du récit de Jean, et l'une des meilleures preuves de la vérité historique de son écrit.

[2] Maldonatus: Theodorus Mopsuest., Chrysostomus, et Euthymius recte fortasse indicant hæc verba, quamvis magnam audaciæ speciem præ se ferant, non audacis sed timidi esse hominis, amantis tamen Christum, a quo eum certum mortis, ut putabat, periculum avellere non posset. Bengel: Erat quasi medius inter hanc vitam et mortem, sine tristitiâ et sine lætitiâ paratus ad moriendum; non tamen sine fide.

[3] *In Joh. Hom.* lxii.

of the Jews that burial should immediately follow on death (Acts v. 6, 10), had been buried upon the same, as a comparison of this verse with ver. 39 clearly shows.

But before the arrival of Him, the true Comforter, other comforters, some formal, all weak, had arrived; drawn to this house of mourning by the providence of God, who would have many witnesses and heralds of this the most wondrous among the wondrous works of his Son. The nearness of Bethany to Jerusalem will have allowed these to be the more numerous; it is therefore noticed here: '*Now Bethany was nigh unto Jerusalem, about fifteen furlongs off*,' that is, about two miles; '*and many of the Jews came to Martha and Mary*,[1] *to comfort them concerning their brother*.' It was part of the Jewish ceremonial of mourning, which was all most accurately defined,[2] that there should be a large gathering of friends and acquaintance, not less than ten, to condole with those that mourned for their dead (1 Sam. xxxi. 13; 1 Chron. vii. 22; Job ii. 11; Jer. xvi. 6, 7). Such condolence was sometimes, and on the part of some, the true 'sons of consolation,' a reality; yet oftentimes a heartless form on the one side (Job's Comforters have become a byeword), as an aggravation of grief on the other; at times it was a treacherous mockery, when the very authors of the sorrow offered themselves as the comforters in it (Gen. xxxvii. 35). But now *He* comes, who could indeed comfort the mourners and wipe away tears from their eyes. Yet He enters not

[1] Αἱ περὶ Μαρίαν καὶ Μάρθαν, to signify Martha and Mary themselves, is an idiom familiar to all, and occurs again, Acts xiii. 13. Still it would scarcely be used, at least in the better times of Greek, concerning any who had not friends and attendants round them; who were not, so to speak, the centre of a circle. Thus Lampe rightly: Nec facile occurret phrasis nisi de personis illustribus, qui amicorum aut ministrorum grege cincti erant. Colligi ergo ex eâ quoque hîc potest quod Martha et Maria lautioris fortunæ fuerint.

[2] The days of mourning were thirty: of these the first three were days of *weeping* (fletus); then followed seven of *lamentation* (planctus); the remaining twenty of *mourning* (mœror). See the art. 'Mourning,' in the *Dict. of the Bible*.

the house; that was already occupied by '*the Jews*,' by those for the most part alien, even where they were not hostile, to Him. Not amid the disturbing influences of that uncongenial circle shall his first interview with the sorrowing sisters find place. Probably He tarried outside the town, and not very far from the spot where Lazarus was buried; for else, when Mary went to meet Him, the Jews could scarcely have exclaimed, '*She goeth unto the grave to weep there*' (ver. 31). From thence He may have suffered the tidings to go before Him that He was at hand.

'*Then Martha, as soon as she heard that Jesus was coming, went and met Him; but Mary sat still in the house.*' We are not, in this hastening of the one and tarrying of the other, to trace, as many have done, the different characteristics of the two sisters, or to find an ethical parallel here to Luke x. 39. For on that former occasion, when Mary chose to sit still, she did so because it was at '*Jesus' feet*' that she was sitting; this nearness to Him, and not the sitting still, was then the attraction. The same motives which kept her in stillness then, would now have brought her on swiftest wings of love to the place where the Master was. Moreover, so soon as ever she did hear that her Lord was come and called for her, '*she arose quickly, and came unto Him*' (ver. 29). 'It was not,' to use Chrysostom's words, 'that Martha was now more zealous; but Mary had not heard.' This much characteristic of the two sisters may very probably lie in the narrative, namely, that Martha, engaged in active employments even in the midst of her grief, may have been more in the way of hearing what was happening abroad, while Mary, in her deeper and stiller anguish, was sitting retired in the house,[1] and less within reach of such rumours from the outer world.[2]

[1] On sitting as the attitude of grief see Neh. i. 4; Job ii. 8, 13; Ezek. viii. 14; Matt. xxvii. 61; Luke xv. 18.

[2] Maldonatus: Quia enim dixerat Martham obviam Christo processisse, ne quis miraretur, aut Mariam accusaret quod non et ipsa processisset, excusat eam tacite, dicens sedisse domi, ideoque nihil de Christi

Martha too is ready to change words with 'the Master;' while the deeper anguish of Mary finds utterance in that one phrase: '*Lord, if Thou hadst been here, my brother had not died*;' and then she is silent. These words indeed are common to both (see p. 442); for it is the bitterest drop in the cup of their common anguish, that all might so easily have been otherwise. Had this sickness befallen at another moment, when their Lord was within easier reach, all might have been averted; they might have been rejoicing in a living, instead of mourning over a dead, brother. At the same time to imagine that there is any the slightest reproach latent in the words is quite to misconceive the spirit in which they are uttered. In their way they are rather words of faith. But Martha has much more to say. There are hopes, though she ventures only at a distance to allude to them, which she is cherishing still: '*But I know that even now*, even now when all seems over, *whatsoever Thou wilt ask*[1] *of God, God will give it Thee.*' High thoughts and poor thoughts of Christ cross one another here;—high thoughts, in that she sees in Him one whose effectual fervent prayers will greatly prevail;—poor thoughts, in that she regards Him as *obtaining* by prayer that which properly He *has* by the oneness of his nature with the Father.[2]

With words purposely ambiguous, being meant for the trying of her faith, Jesus assures her that the deep, though unuttered, longing of her heart shall indeed be granted; '*Thy brother shall rise again.*' But though her heart could

adventu cognovisse. Martha enim cognovit, quia credibile est domo aliquâ causâ fuisse progressam, et solent qui foris in publico versantur, multos colligere rumores, quos ignorant, qui domi delitescunt.

[1] She uses αἰτεῖν (ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσῃ), a word never employed by our Lord to express his own asking of the Father, but always ἐρωτᾶν: for there is a certain familiarity, nay authority, in his askings, which ἐρωτᾶν expresses, but αἰτεῖν would not; see my *Synonyms of the New Testament*, § 40.

[2] Grotius: Et hîc infirmitas apparet. Putat illum gratiosum esse apud Deum, non autem in illo esse plenitudinem Divinæ potestatis.

take in the desire for so immense a boon, it cannot take in its actual granting (cf. Acts xii. 5, 15); it shrinks back half in unbelief from the receiving of it. She cannot believe that these words mean more than that he, with all other faithful Israelites, will stand in his lot at the last day; and with a slight movement of impatience at such cold comfort, comfort that so little met the present longings of her heart, which were to have her brother now, she answers, '*I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day.*' Her love was as yet earthly, clinging passionately to the earthly objects of its affection, but needing to be infinitely exalted and purified. Unless the Lord had lifted her into a higher region of life, it would have profited her little that He had granted her heart's desire.[1] What would it have helped her to receive back her brother, if again she was presently to lose him, if once more they were to be parted asunder by his death or her own? This lower boon would only prove a boon at all, if both were alike made partakers of a higher life in Christ; then, indeed, death would have no more power over them, then they would truly possess one another, and for ever: and to this the wondrously deep and loving words of Christ would lead her. They are no unseasonable preaching of truths remote from her present needs, but the answer to the very deepest want of her soul; they would lead her from a lost brother to a present Saviour, a Saviour in whom alone that brother could be truly and for ever found. '*Jesus said unto her, I am the Resurrection, and the Life*; the everlasting triumphs over death, they are *in Me*—no remote benefits, as thou speakest of now, to find place *at the last day*; no powers separate or separable from Me, as thou spakest of lately, when thou desiredst

[1] This is the sublime thought of Wordsworth's *Laodamia*. She who gives her name to that noble poem does not lift herself, and has none to lift her, into those higher regions in which the return of the beloved would be a blessing and a boon; and thus it proves to her a joyless, disappointing gift, presently again to be snatched away.

that I should ask of Another that which I possess evermore in Myself. In Me is victory over the grave, in Me is life eternal: by faith in Me that becomes yours which makes death not to be death, but only the transition to a better life.'

Such is the general meaning and scope of these glorious words. When we ask ourselves what this title, '*The Resurrection*,' involves, we perceive that in one aspect it is something more, in another something less, than that other title of '*The Life*,' which Christ also challenges for his own. It is more, for it is life in conflict with and overcoming death; it is life being the death of death, meeting it in its highest manifestation, that of physical dissolution and decay, and vanquishing it there (Isai. xxv. 8; xxvi. 19; Dan. xii. 2). It is less, for so long as that title belongs to Him, it implies something still undone, a mortality not yet wholly swallowed up in life, a last enemy not yet wholly destroyed and put under his feet (1 Cor. xv. 25, 26). As He is '*the Resurrection*' of the dead, so is He '*the Life*' of the living—absolute life, having life in Himself, for so it has been given Him of the Father (John v. 26), the one fountain of life;[1] so that all who receive not life from Him pass into the state of death, first the death of the spirit, and then, as the completion of their death, the death also of the body.

What follows, '*He that believeth in Me, though he were dead*'—or better, '*though he have died*'—'*yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die*,' is not obscure in the sum total of its meaning; yet so to interpret it, as to prevent the two clauses of the sentence from containing a repetition, and to find progress in them, is not easy. If we compare this passage with John vi. 32–59, and observe the repeated stress which is there laid on the raising up at the last day, as the great quickening work of

[1] Ὁ ζῶν (Rev. i. 8); ὁ ζωοποιῶν (Rom. iv. 17); ἡ ζωὴ ἡμῶν (Col. iii. 4); πηγὴ ζωῆς (Ps. xxxv. 9, LXX); ὁ μόνος ἔχων τὴν ἀθανασίαν (1 Tim. vi. 16).

the Son of God (ver. 39, 40, 44, 54), we shall not hesitate to make the declaration, '*yet shall he live*,' in the first clause here, to be equivalent to the words, '*I will raise him up at the last day*,' there, and this whole first clause will then be the unfolding of the words, '*I am the Resurrection*;' as such He will rescue every one that believeth on Him from death and the grave. In like manner, the second clause answers to, and is the expansion of, the more general declaration, '*I am the Life*;' that is, 'Whosoever liveth, every one that draweth the breath of life and believeth upon Me, shall know the power of an everlasting life, shall never truly die.' Here, as so often in our Lord's words, the temporal death is taken no account of, but quite overlooked, and the believer in Him is contemplated as already lifted above death, and made partaker of everlasting life (John vi. 47; cf. Ephes. ii. 6; 1 John iii. 14).[1]

Having claimed all this for Himself, He demands of Martha whether she can receive it: '*Believest thou this*,—that I am this Lord of life and of death? Doth thy faith in the divine verities of the resurrection and eternal life after death centre in Me?' Her answer, '*Yea, Lord, I believe that Thou art the Christ, the Son of God, which should come into the world*' (i. 9; vi. 14; ix. 35; Matt. xi. 3), is perhaps more direct than at first sight it appears. For one of the offices of Christ the Messiah was, according to the Jewish expectations, to raise the dead; and thus, confessing Him to be the Christ, she implicitly confessed Him also to be the quickener of the dead. Or she may mean,—'I believe all glorious things concerning Thee; there is nought which I do not believe concerning Thee, since I believe Thee to be Him in whom every glorious gift for the world is centred,'—speaking like one whose faith, as that of most persons at all times must be, was implicit rather than explicit; she did not know all which that

[1] Bengel: Mors Christi mortem enervavit. Post mortem Christi mors credentium non est mors.

name, '*the Christ, the Son of God,*' involved, but all which it did involve she was ready to believe.

She says no more; for now she will make her sister partaker of the joyful tidings that He, the long waited for, long desired, is arrived at last. Some good thing too, it may be, she expects from his high and mysterious words, though she knows not precisely what: a ray of comfort has found its way into her heart, and she would fain make her sister a sharer in this. Yet she told not her tidings openly, suspecting, and having sufficient cause to suspect (ver. 46), that some of their visitors from Jerusalem might be of unfriendly disposition towards the Lord. '*She called Mary her sister secretly, saying, The Master is come, and calleth for thee.*' '*The Master,*' as already suggested, was a name, probably *the* name, whereby the Lord was known in the innermost circle of his own (Matt. xxiii. 8; John xx. 16; xiii. 13). That He had asked for Mary, we had not hitherto learned. '*As soon as she heard that, she arose quickly, and came unto Him.*' The Jews take it for granted that she is hastening in a paroxysm of her grief to the grave, to weep there; as it was the custom of Jewish women often to visit the graves of their kindred,[1] and this especially during the first days of their mourning;—and they follow; for thus was it provided of God that this miracle should have many witnesses. '*Then when Mary was come where Jesus was, and saw Him, she fell down at his feet.*'[2] Nothing of the kind is recorded of Martha (ver. 20), whether this be the accident of a fuller narrative in one place than in the other; or, as is more probable, that we have here a characteristic touch differencing one

[1] Rosenmüller, *Alte und Neue Morgenland,* vol. iv. p. 281; Geier, *De Luctu Hebræorum,* vii. § 26.

[2] Compare Cicero's account of his first interview with a Sicilian mother whom the lust and cruelty of Verres had made desolate (*II. In Verr.* v. 49): Mihi obviam venit, et ita me suam salutem appellans, filii nomen implorans, mihi ad pedes misera jacuit, quasi ego excitare filium ejus ab inferis possem.

sister from the other. But even if their demeanour is different, their first words are the same: '*Lord, if Thou hadst been here, my brother had not died.*' The words with which her sister had greeted the Lord thus repeating themselves a second time from her lips, give us a glimpse of all that had passed in that mournful house, since the beloved was laid in earth. Often during that four days' interval the sisters had said one to the other, how different the issues might have been, if the divine friend had been with them. Such had been the one thought in the hearts, the one word upon the lips, of both, and therefore was so naturally the first spoken by each, and that altogether independently of the other. She says no more. What the Lord can do, or will do, she remits altogether to Him, not so much as suggesting on her own part aught.

At the spectacle of all this grief, the sisters weeping, and even the more indifferent visitors from Jerusalem weeping likewise, the Lord also '*groaned in the spirit, and was troubled.*'[1] The word which we translate '*groaned*'[2]

[1] Augustine lays an emphasis on this *ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν*, turbavit seipsum (*In Ev. Joh. tract.* xlix.): Quis enim eum posset nisi se ipse turbare? (cf. *De Civ. Dei*, xiv. 9. 3); and Bengel: Affectus Jesu non fuere passiones, sed voluntariæ commotiones, quas plane in suâ potestate habebat; et hæc turbatio fuit plena ordinis et rationis summæ. It would then express something of the *μετριοπάθεια* of the Academy, as opposed on the one side to frantic outbreaks of grief, on the other to the *ἀπάθεια* of the Stoics. His grief no doubt did keep this mean; but this active *ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν* must not be pressed; since elsewhere on similar occasions we have the passive, *ἐταράχθη τῷ πνεύματι* (John xiii. 21; cf. xii. 27), with which this is identical.

[2] *Ἐμβριμάομαι* (from *βρίμη*, Βριμώ, a name of Persephone or Hecate, signifying The Angered, so called *διὰ τὸ φοβερὸν καὶ καταπληκτικὸν τοῦ δαίμονος*, Lucian; and cognate with fremo, *βρῖθος*, *φριμάω*) does not mean to be moved with *any* strong passion, as grief or fear, but always implies anger and indignation. See Passow, s. v.; and so all the Greek interpreters; the Vulgate, which has infremuit; and Luther: Er ergrimmete im Geiste. Storr (*Opusc. Acad.* vol. iii. p. 254): Quem vulgo sumunt *tristitiæ* significatum, is plane incertus esse videtur, cum nullo, quod sciamus, exemplo confirmari possit, Græcisque patribus tam valde ignotus fuerit, ut materiam ad succensendum, quamvis non repertam in Mariæ et

is far more expressive of indignation and displeasure than of grief; which last, save as a certain amount of it is contained in all displeasure, it means not at all. But at what and with whom was Jesus thus indignant? The notion of some Greek expositors,[1] that He was indignant with Himself,—that we have here the indications of an inward struggle to repress, as something weak and unworthy, that human pity, which found presently its utterance in tears,—cannot be accepted for an instant. Christianity demands the regulation of the natural affections, but it does not, like the Stoic philosophy, demand their suppression; so far from this, it bids us to 'weep with them that weep' (Rom. xii. 15); and, in the beautiful words of Leighton, that we 'seek not altogether to dry the stream of sorrow, but to bound it, and keep it within its banks.' Some, as Theodore of Mopsuestia and Lampe, suppose Him indignant in spirit at the hostile dispositions which He already traced among the Jews that were present, the unbelief on their part with which He foresaw that signal work of his would be received. Others, that his indignation was excited by the unbelief of Martha and Mary and the others, which they manifested in their weeping, testifying thereby that they did not believe that He would raise their dead. But He Himself was presently to weep; and there was nothing in these natural tears of theirs to rouse a feeling of displeasure.

comitum ejus ploratu, quærerent certe in humanæ naturæ (*τῆς σαρκός*) Jesu propensione ad tristitiam, quam Jesus . . . increpaverit. With this consent the other passages in the N. T. where *ἐμβριμᾶσθαι* is used, as twice of our Lord *commanding, under the threat of his earnest displeasure,* those whom He had healed, to keep silence (Matt. ix. 30; Mark i. 43); and once of those who were indignant with Mary in the matter of the ointment (*καὶ ἐνεβριμῶντο αὐτῇ*, Mark xiv. 5). Compare Isai. xvii. 13 (Symmachus) and Ps. xxxviii. 4 (Symm. and Aquila), and *ἐμβρίμημα ὀργῆς*, Jer. ii. 8 (LXX). Lampe and Kuinoel defend the right explanation; and Lange (*Theol. Stud. und Krit.* 1836, p. 714, seq.); but by far the completest discussion on *ἐμβριμᾶσθαι*, and its exact meaning here, is by Gumlich in these same *Studien*, 1862, pp. 260–268.

[1] See Suicer, *Thes.* s. v. *ἐμβριμάομαι.*

This indignation of his is capable of a perfectly adequate explanation. It was the indignation which the Lord of life felt at all that sin had wrought. He beheld death in all its dread significance, as the wages of sin; the woes of a whole world, of which this was but a little sample, rose up before his eyes; all its mourners and all its graves were present to Him. For that He was about to wipe away the tears of those present and turn for a little while their sorrow into joy, did not truly alter the case. Lazarus rose again, but only to taste a second time the bitterness of death; these mourners He might comfort, but only for a season; these tears He might stanch, only again hereafter to flow; and how many had flowed and must flow with no such Comforter to wipe them, even for a season, away. As He contemplated all this, a mighty indignation at the author of all this human anguish possessed his heart. And now He will no longer delay, but will at once do battle with death and with him that hath the power of death, the devil; and spoiling, though but in part, the goods of the strong man armed, will give proof that a Stronger is here.[1] And that they may the sooner stand face to face, He demands, '*Where have ye laid him? They said unto Him, Lord, come and see. Jesus wept*,'[2] or, more accurately, '*shed*

[1] Apollinarius: Ὡσεί τις γενναῖος ἀριστεὺς τοὺς πολεμίους ἰδὼν, ἑαυτὸν παρώξυνε κατὰ τῶν ἀντιπάλων. Melanchthon: Fremitus indignatio quædam est quâ commovetur Christus adversus regnum mortis, volens peccatum et mortem evacuare, ut ostendat se odisse regnum mortis, nec velle ut pereat peccator.

[2] We may compare, for purposes of contrast, the words of Artemis in that majestic concluding scene in the *Hippolytus* of Euripides, where, in the midst of his misery, Hippolytus asks,

Ὁρᾷς με, δέσποιν', ὡς ἔχω, τὸν ἄθλιον;

and she answers,

Ὁρῶ, κατ' ὄσσων δ' οὐ θέμις βαλεῖν δάκρυ.

Full as is that scene of soothing and elevating power, and even of a divine sympathy, yet a God of tears was a higher conception than the heathen world could reach to. After indeed the Son of God had come, and in so strange and inexplicable a way had begun to modify the whole feeling

tears,'[1] Himself borne along with the high tide of sorrow, and not seeking to resist it. There are yet before Him two other occasions of tears (Luke xix. 41; Heb. v. 7). 'The tears of the text,' says Donne, 'are as a spring, a well, belonging to one household, the sisters of Lazarus. The tears over Jerusalem are as a river, belonging to a whole country. The tears upon the Cross are as the sea, belonging to the whole world.'[2]

Some of the Jews present, moved to good will by this lively sympathy of the Lord with the sorrows of those around Him, exclaimed, '*Behold how He loved him!*' Not, however, all: '*Some of them said, Could not this man, which opened the eyes of the blind, have caused that even this man should not have died?*' It is an invidious suggestion. He weeps over this calamity now, but was it not in his power to avert it, if He had chosen? He who could open the eyes of the blind (they refer to the case which, through

of the heathen world, long before men had even heard of his name, the Roman poet, in a passage among the noblest which antiquity supplies, could express himself thus:

> . . . mollissima corda
> Humano generi dare se natura fatetur,
> Quæ lacrymas dedit: *hæc nostri pars optima sensûs.*
> Juvenal, *Sat.* xv. 131–133.

On the sinlessness of these natural affections, or rather on their necessity for a complete humanity, see Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, xiv. 9. 3; and often.

[1] For thus the distinction, scarcely accidental, between the κλαίοντες of the others and his ἐδάκρυσεν, would be preserved. Elsewhere (Luke xix. 41) the κλαίειν is itself ascribed to Him. Here, as Bengel puts it well, lacrymatus est, non ploravit. There is a fine passage in Spenser's *Fairy Queen*, ii. 1. 42, when Sir Guyon lights on the corpse of Mordant, which may or may not have been written with this passage in view. After describing the horror with which the spectacle of the dead filled Sir Guyon, the poet goes on—

> 'At last his mighty ghost gan deep to groan,
> As lion, grudging in his great disdain,
> Mourns inwardly, and makes to himself moan,
> Till ruth and frail affection did constrain
> His stout courage to stoop, and shew his inward pain.'

[2] For 'upon the Cross,' which is inaccurate, as there were no tears shed there, Donne must have intended to write 'at Gethsemane.'

the judicial investigation that followed, had made so much noise at Jerusalem, John ix.), could He not (by his prayer to God) have hindered that this man should have died? There were indeed in this accusation, as so often in similar cases, assumptions mutually excluding one another; the assumption that He possessed such power and favour with God as would have enabled Him to stay the stroke of death, resting on the assumption of so eminent a goodness upon his part, as would have secured that his power should not be grudgingly restrained in any case suitable for its exercise. It is characteristic of the truth of this narrative (although it has been urged as an argument against it), that they, dwellers in Jerusalem, should refer to this miracle which had so lately been performed there, rather than to the previous raisings from the dead, which in themselves were so much more to the point, as evidence of that dominion over death which He might have exerted had He willed. But those, accomplished at an earlier period of his ministry and in the remoter Galilee, they may have only heard of by obscure report, if indeed they had heard of them at all. This miracle on the contrary, so recently wrought, and at their very doors, which had roused so much contradiction, which it had been so vainly attempted to prove an imposture, was exactly the mighty work of the Lord that would be uppermost in their thoughts. Yet for all this we may feel sure that the maker-up of the narrative from later and insecure traditions would inevitably have adduced those miracles of a like kind, as evidences of the power of Jesus over death.

He meanwhile and they have reached the tomb, though not without another access of that indignant horror, another of those mighty shudderings, which shook the frame of the Lord of life,—so dreadful did death seem to Him who, looking *through* all its natural causes, at which we often stop short, saw it altogether as the seal and token of

sin; so unnatural did its usurpation appear over a race made for immortality (Wisd. i. 13, 14): '*Jesus therefore again groaning in Himself cometh to the grave.*' This, as the whole course of the narrative shows, was without the town (ver. 30), according to the universal custom of the East (Luke vii. 12), which did not suffer a depositing of the dead among the living.[1] '*It was a cave, and a stone lay upon it.*' Such were commonly the family vaults of the Jews; sometimes natural (Gen. xxiii. 9; Judith xvi. 24), sometimes, as was this,[2] artificial and hollowed out by man's labour from the rock (Isai. xxii. 16; Matt. xxvii. 60); in a garden (John xix. 41), or in some field the possession of the family (Gen. xxiii. 9, 17–20; xxxv. 18; 2 Kin. xxi. 26); with recesses in the sides wherein the bodies were laid (Isai. xiv. 15; Ezek. xxxii. 23); occasionally with chambers one beyond another. Sometimes the entrance to these tombs was on a level; sometimes, as most probably here, there was a descent to them by steps. The stone which blocked up the entrance, only with difficulty removed (Mark xvi. 3), kept aloof the beasts of prey, above all the numerous jackals, which else might have found their way into these receptacles of the dead, and torn the bodies. The tomb of our blessed Lord Himself, with its 'door,' appears rather to have had a horizontal entrance.[3]

Among many slighter indications that Mary and Martha were not among the poor of their people, this, that they should possess such a family vault, is one. The possession of such, in the very nature of things, must have been a privilege of the wealthier classes; only such would be thus laid in the sepulchres of their fathers;[4] the dead bodies of

[1] Rosenmüller, *Alte und neue Morgenland*, vol. iv. p. 281.

[2] Ammonius: Ἄντρον καὶ σπήλαιον διαφέρει· ἄντρον μὲν τὸ αὐτοφυὲς κοίλωμα· σπήλαιον δὲ τὸ χειροποίητον. It is σπήλαιον here.

[3] See Winer, *Realwörterbuch*, s. v. Gräber; and *Dict. of the Bible*, art. Burial.

[4] Becker (*Charicles*, vol. ii. p. 190) observes the same of the μνήματα among the Greeks. For the poorer classes there were burial-places in

others would be brought 'into the graves of the common people' (Jer. xxvi. 23). We have another indication of the same in the large concourse of mourners, and those certainly not of the meaner sort, who assemble from Jerusalem to console the sisters in their bereavement; for even in grief it is too often true, that 'wealth maketh many friends; but the poor is separated from his neighbour' (Prov. xix. 4). The pound of ointment of spikenard, '*very costly*,' with which Mary anoints the Saviour's feet (John xii. 3), points the same way. She who was 'troubled about many things' (Luke x. 41) was probably the mistress of a numerous household about which to be troubled; and the language of the original at ver. 19, however it may designate Martha and Mary, and not those around them, yet designates them *as the centre of an assemblage*. Chrysostom assumes the sisters to have been highborn,[1] as generally do the early interpreters. 'The blessed Martha,' says Bishop Fisher in a sermon preached in 1509, 'was a woman of noble blood, to whom by inheritance belonged the castle of Bethany.' He here lays, as others before him had done, a mistaken emphasis upon '*the town of Mary and her sister Martha*' (ver. 1), concluding from these words that Bethany belonged to them. The Levitical law rendered, and was intended to render, any such accumulation of landed property in the hands of one or two persons impossible; not to say that, by as good a right, Bethsaida might be concluded to have belonged to Andrew and Peter, for the language is exactly similar (John i. 45).

'*Jesus said, Take ye away the stone. Martha, the sister of him that was dead, saith unto Him, Lord, by this time he stinketh; for he hath been dead four days.*' Why does St. John designate Martha as '*the sister of him that was dead*,' when this was abundantly plain before? Probably to

common, as with the Romans also (see his *Gallus*, vol. ii. p. 293; and the *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Antt.* s. v. Funus, p. 436).

[1] Εὐγενέστεραι.

account for her remonstrance. The sister of the dead, she would be more shocked than another at the thought of the exposure of that countenance, upon which corruption had already set its seal; she would most shudderingly contemplate that beloved form made a spectacle to strangers now when it was become an abhorring even to them that had loved it best.[1] Yet the words of her remonstrance must not be understood as an experience which she now makes, but rather as a conclusion which mentally she draws from the length of time during which the body had already lain in the grave. With the rapid decomposition that goes forward in a hot country, necessitating as it does an almost immediate burial, the '*four days*' might very well have brought this about; indeed, under actual conditions, could hardly have failed so to do. At the same time, it gives to this miracle almost a monstrous character, if we suppose it was actually the reanimating of a body which had already undergone the process of corruption. Rather He who sees the end from the beginning, and who had intended that Lazarus should live again, had watched over that body in his providence, that it should not hasten to corruption. If the Greek poet could imagine a divine power guarding from all defeature and wrong the body which was thus preserved only for an honourable burial;[2] by how much more may we assume a like preservation for that body which, not in the world of fiction, but of realities, was to become again so soon the tabernacle for the soul of one of Christ's servants. No conclusion of an opposite kind can be drawn from Martha's words, spoken, as they plainly are, *before* the stone has been removed.[3]

[1] Godet brings this out well—but also makes another point: C'est donc ici une exclamation dictée par un sentiment de respect pour celui à qui elle parle: *Seigneur*, et par une sorte de pudeur pour la personne, sacrée pour elle, de celui dont il s'agit.

[2] Homer, *Il.* xxiv. 18–21.

[3] It is singular how generally this ἤδη ὄζει is taken in proof of that,

This much, however, her words do reveal—that her faith in Christ, as able even then to quicken her dead brother, had already failed. There is nothing strange in this. Faith, such as hers, would inevitably have these alternating ebbs and flows; from which, indeed, a much stronger faith would scarcely be exempt. All which she concludes from this command to remove the stone is a desire on the Lord's part to look once more on the countenance of his friend; from this purpose she would fain recall Him, by urging how death and corruption must have been busy in that tomb where her brother had already slept his four days' sleep. The Lord checks and rebukes her unbelief: '*Said I not unto thee, that, if thou wouldest believe, thou shouldest see the glory of God?*' Here, as ever, faith is set forth as the condition under which alone his miraculous power can be exerted. But when had He said this? Was it in that conversation which He held with her when first they met? or in some prior conversation, which St. John has not recorded? Not, I should say, either in this or in that; but these very words occur in the message which the Lord sends back to the sorrowing sisters when He first learns the sickness of his friend (ver. 4), the

whereof it is only a conjecture, and, I am persuaded, an erroneous one; the τεταρταῖος γάρ ἐστι, which follows, being to me decisive that Martha only guesses from the common order of things that corruption will have already begun. Yet Augustine (*In Ev. Joh. tract.* xlix.): Resuscitavit putentem. Tertullian (*De Resurr. Carn.* 53) speaks of the *soul* of Lazarus, quam nemo jam fœtere senserat. Hilary (*De Trin.* vi. § 33): Fœtens Lazarus. Ambrose says of the bystanders (*De Fide Resurr.* ii. 80): Fœtorem sentiunt. Bernard (*In Assum. Serm.* iv.): Fœtere jam cœperat. Sedulius: Corruptum tabo exhalabat odorem. Compare Prudentius (*Apotheosis*, 759–766); Chrysostom (*Hom.* lii. *in Joh.*); and Calvin: Alios Christus suscitavit, sed nunc in putrido cadavere potentiam suam exserit. In the *Letter of Pontius Pilate* to the Emperor Tiberius (Thilo, *Codex Apocryphus*, p. 807) this circumstance, as enhancing the wonder of the miracle, is urged with characteristic exaggerations: Νεκρόν τινα Λάζαρον τεταρήμερον ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνέστησε, διεφθαρμένον ἤδη ἔχοντα τὸ σῶμα ὑπὸ τῶν ἑλκογενήτων σκωλήκων· καὶ τὸ δυσῶδες ἐκεῖνο σῶμα τὸ κείμενον ἐν τῷ τάφῳ ἐκέλευσε τρέχειν· καὶ ὡς ἐκ παστοῦ νυμφίος, οὗτος ἐκ τοῦ τάφρου ἐξῆλθεν εὐωδίας πλείστης πεπληρωμένος.

message itself furnishing the key to the whole subsequent narrative. To those words, so spoken, He refers.

And now Martha acquiesces: no longer opposes the hindrance of her unbelief to the work which the Lord would accomplish. '*Then*,' those nearest of kin thus consenting, '*they took away the stone from the place where the dead was laid. And Jesus lifted up his eyes, and said, Father, I thank Thee that Thou hast heard Me.*' The thanks *to* the Father are an acknowledgment that the power which He is about to display is *from* the Father (John v. 19, 20). But any such thanksgiving might easily have been misinterpreted by the disciples then, and by the Church afterwards; as though it would have been possible for the Father *not* to have heard Him,—as though He had first obtained this power to call Lazarus from his grave, after supplication,—had, like Elisha (2 Kin. iv. 33–35), by dint of prayer (cf. Acts ix. 40) painfully won back the life which had departed; whereas the power was most truly his own, not indeed in disconnexion from the Father, for what He saw the Father do, that also He did (John v. 19, 21); but in this, his oneness with the Father, lay for Him the power of doing these mighty acts.[1] Therefore He explains, evidently not any more in a voice audible by all those present, but so that his disciples might hear Him, what this '*Father, I thank Thee*,' meant, and why it was spoken: '*And I knew that Thou hearest Me always: but because of the people which stand by I said it, that they may believe that Thou hast sent Me*' (cf. 1 Kin. xviii. 36, 37). For them it was wholesome: they should thus understand that He claimed his power from above, and not from beneath; that there was no magic, no necromancy here.

Chrysostom supposes that when this thanksgiving prayer was uttered, Lazarus was already reanimated; but

[1] Chrysostom (*Hom.* lxiv. *in Joh.*) enters at large upon this point. Maldonatus observes: Nihil enim aliud his verbis quam essentiæ voluntatisque unitatem significari. Cf. Ambrose, *De Fide*, iii. 4.

this is assuredly a mistake. The Son renders by anticipation thanks to the Father, so confident is He that He too wields the keys of death and of the grave, and that these will give up their prey at his bidding, that He too can quicken whom He will (John v. 21). '*And when He had thus spoken, He cried*[1] *with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth*' (cf. Mark v. 41; Luke vii. 14; viii. 54; Acts ix. 40). To this '*cry with a loud voice*,'[2] calling the things which are not as though they were (Ezek. xxxvii. 4), and heard through all the chambers of death, the quickening power is everywhere in Scripture ascribed. Thus at John v. 28, 29: 'The hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves *shall hear his voice*, and shall come forth;' and again at 1 Thess. iv. 16, it is at the descent of the Lord 'with a shout, with the voice of the Archangel,'—which voice is his own, for Scripture knows of no other Archangel,—that the dead in Him will rise; while 'the last trump' (1 Cor. xv. 52) is probably this same voice of God, sounding through all the kingdom of death.

'*And he that was dead came forth*,[3] *bound hand and foot with grave-clothes*,[4] *and his face was bound about with a napkin*.' Some, in their zeal for multiplying miracles, make it a new miracle, a wonder within a wonder,[5] as St. Basil calls it, that Lazarus so bound was able to obey the summons. But in that case to what end the further word,

[1] This κρανγάζειν, which is stronger than κράζειν (John vii. 28; xii. 44), is nowhere else attributed to the Lord; but see Heb. v. 7; cf. Matt. xii. 19: οὐδὲ κρανγάσει.

[2] Cyril calls it θεοπρεπὲς καὶ βασιλικὸν κέλευσμα. Bernard: Abyssus abyssum vocat. Abyssus luminis et misericordiæ abyssum mortis et tenebrarum.

[3] Hilary (*De Trin.* vi. § 33): Nullo intervallo vocis et vitæ.

[4] Κειρίαι = τὰ σχοινία τὰ ἐντάφια = ὀθόνια (John xix. 40) = vincula linea (Tertullian). These were swathes, not to be identified with the σινδών mentioned by the other Evangelists.

[5] Θαῦμα ἐν θαύματι: cf. Ambrose, *De Fid. Res.* ii. 78; and so Augustine (*Enarr. in Ps.* ci. 21): Processit ille *vinctus*: non ergo pedibus propriis, sed virtute producentis.

'*Loose him, and let him go*'?[1] Probably he was loosely involved in these grave-clothes, which hindering all free action, yet did not hinder motion altogether; or possibly, in accordance with the Egyptian fashion, every limb was wrapped round with these stripes by itself, just as in the mummies each separate finger has sometimes its own wrapping.

The Gospel narrative is, if one may so speak, always epic, never idyllic; St. John therefore leaves us to imagine their joy, who thus beyond all expectation received back their dead from the grave; a joy which so few have shared among all the mourners of all times,

> 'Who to the verge have followed that they love,
> And on the insuperable threshold stand;
> With cherished names its speechless calm reprove,
> And stretch in the abyss their ungrasped hand.'

Not attempting to picture this, he proceeds to trace the historic significance of the miracle, the permitted link which it formed in that chain of events, which should issue, according to the determinate decree and counsel of

[1] Of Lazarus himself we have but one further notice (John xii. 2), but that, like the command to give meat to the revived maiden (Mark v. 43), like the Lord's own participation of food after the resurrection (Luke xxiv. 42; John xxi. 13), a witness against anything merely *phantastic* in his rising again. He is generally assumed to have been much younger than his sisters; one tradition mentioned by Epiphanius makes him thirty years old at this time, and to have survived for thirty years more. The traditions of his later life, as that he became bishop of Marseilles, rest upon no good authority: yet there is one circumstance of these traditions worthy of record, although not for its historic worth,—that the first question he asked the Lord after he was come back from the grave, was whether he should have to die again; and, learning that it must needs be so, that he never smiled any more. Lazarus, as a *revenant*, is often used by the religious romance-writers of the Middle Ages as a vehicle for their conceptions of the other world. He is made to relate what he has seen and known, just as the Pamphylian that revived is used by Plato in the *Republic* for the same purposes (Wright, *St. Patrick's Purgatory*, pp. 167–169). There is a very interesting and a singularly ingenious article upon Lazarus in the *Dict. of the Bible*, identifying him with the young man that had great possessions, and on a former occasion went away from the Lord sorrowful (Matt. xix. 22).

God, in the atoning death of the Son of God upon the cross. '*Then many of the Jews which came to Mary, and had seen the things which Jesus did, believed on Him; but some of them went their ways to the Pharisees, and told them what things Jesus had done.*' Origen supposes that these last went with a good intention, as having that now to tell which even the Pharisees themselves could no longer affect to resist, which must win them also to the acknowledgment that this was the Christ. Yet the manner in which this notice is introduced fails to support this more charitable construction of their purpose. St. John does here what he does evermore, divides the light from the darkness, the belief from the unbelief, and marks the progressive growth of the one and of the other. It is interesting to note the numerous other occasions on which he does the same; thus compare vi. 66–69; vii. 12; 40–43; 47–52; ix. 16; x. 19–21; to which add Acts xvii. 34; xxviii. 24. Those who went and told the Pharisees were spectators of the miracle who on one plea or another refused to be convinced by it (Luke xvi. 31), and who, reporting to the professed enemies of the Lord this latest and most imposing work of his, would irritate them yet more against Him,[1] would make them feel the instant need of effectually counterworking, if possible putting out of the way, one who had done, or had seemed to do, so notable a work; St. John, it will be observed, links immediately with this report to the Pharisees a new and increased activity in their hostile machinations against the Lord.

They are indeed now seriously alarmed. They anticipate, and correctly (see xii. 10, 11, 17–19), the effect which this mighty work will have upon the people, and they gather in council together against the Lord and against his Anointed. They do not pause to inquire whether '*this man*,' as they contemptuously call Him,—

[1] Euthymius: Οὐχ ὡς θαυμάζοντες, ἀλλὰ διαβάλλοντες ὡς γόητα.

who, even according to their own confession, '*doeth many miracles*' (cf. Acts iv. 16), may not be doing them in the power of God, may not be indeed the promised King of Israel. The question of the truth or falsehood of his claims seems never to enter into their minds, but only the bearing which the acknowledgment of these claims will have on the worldly fortunes of their order. This bearing they contemplate from a somewhat novel point of view: '*If we let Him thus alone, all men will believe on Him; and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation.*' The direct connexion which they traced between the recognition of Jesus as the Christ, and a collision with the Roman power, was probably this. The people will acknowledge Him for the Messiah; He will set Himself at their head, or they by compulsion will set Him there (John vi. 15); hereupon will follow an attempt to throw off the foreign yoke, an attempt to be crushed presently by the overwhelming power of Rome; which will then use the opportunity it has been waiting for long, and will make a general sweep, taking away from us wholly whatsoever survives of our power and independence, '*our place*[1] *and nation.*' Or, without anticipating an actual insurrection, they may have assumed that the mere fact of the Jews acknowledging a Messiah or, in other words, a king of their own, would arouse the jealousy of Rome, would be accounted an act of rebellion, to be visited with these extreme penalties.[2] How sensitive

[1] Τὸν τόπον. Many, as Chrysostom, Theophylact, and others, understand by this their city. But the Jews had much more probably the temple in their thoughts. This, in which all their hopes centred, which to them was the middle point of all, would naturally be uppermost in their minds, while to the city we nowhere find the same exaggerated importance ascribed; see in confirmation 2 Macc. iii. 18; v. 19; Ps. lxxviii. 7; lxxxiii. 4; Isai. lxiv. 10, LXX. This for Origen is so far beyond all question, that, as it seems unconsciously, for τόπον he substitutes ἁγίασμα.

[2] Corn. a Lapide: Si omnes credant Jesum esse Messiam, regem Judæorum, irritabuntur contra nos Romani Judææ domini, quod nobis novum regem et Messiam, puta Jesum, creaverimus, ac a Cæsare Tiberio

that jealousy was, how easily alarmed, we have a thousand proofs. 'Art Thou the King of the Jews?' (John xviii. 33; cf. Acts xvi. 21; xvii. 7, 8) is the point to which the Roman governor comes at once. Augustine stands alone in a somewhat different interpretation—namely, that the Jews were already meditating, as no doubt they always were, the great revolt of a later time, and discerned plainly that the nerves of this enterprise would be effectually cut by the spread of the doctrines of this Prince of peace. Where should they find instruments for their purpose, if many of the fierce 'zealots' (see Acts i. 12) were transformed into meek Apostles? All resistance to the Roman domination would become impossible; and Rome, whensoever she chose, would come and rob them of whatever remained of their national independence.[1] We shall do best, however, in adhering to the more usual interpretation. The question will still remain, Did they who urged this danger, indeed feel the apprehension which they professed? or did they only pretend to fear these consequences from the ministry of Christ, if suffered to go on unhindered; urging this view on account of a party in the Sanhedrim (see John ix. 16), which could only be thus won over to the extreme measures now meditated against Him? The Greek expositors in general suppose that they did but feign this alarm; I must needs believe that herein they were sincere; however, besides this alarm, there may have been deeper and more malignant motives at work in their minds.

Probably many half-measures had been proposed by one member and another of the Sanhedrim for arresting the growing inclination of the people to recognize Jesus as the Christ, and had been debated backward and for-

ad eum defecerimus; quare armati venient et vastabunt et perdent Hierosolymam et Judæam, cum totâ Judæorum gente et republicâ.

[1] *In Ev. Joh. tract.* xlix.: Hoc autem timuerunt, ne si omnes in Christum crederent, nemo remaneret, qui adversus Romanos civitatem Dei templumque defenderet.

ward; such as forbidding them to hear Him; proclaiming anew, as had been done already, that any should be excommunicated who confessed Him to be Christ (John ix. 22). But these measures had been already tried, and had proved insufficient; and in that '*Ye know nothing at all*' of Caiaphas, we have the voice of the bold bad man, silencing, with ill-suppressed contempt, his weak and vacillating colleagues, who could see the danger, while they yet shrank, though not for the truth's sake, from the one course which promised to remove it. He proceeds, '*nor consider that it is expedient for us that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not.*' Guilty or not guilty, this man, who threatens to imperil the whole nation, and, whether He means it or not, to entangle it in a hopeless conflict with the power of Rome, must be taken out of the way.

Caiaphas,[1] who dares thus to come to the point, and to speak the unuttered thought of many in that assembly, was a Sadducee (Acts v. 17). Hengstenberg thinks we may trace in this utterance of his the rudeness and roughness[2] which Josephus ascribes to these as compared with the Pharisees. St. John describes him as '*being the High Priest that same year*,' and repeats the same phrase ver. 51, and again xviii. 13; from which some have concluded, Strauss and Baur for example, that whoever wrote this Gospel accounted the High Priesthood a yearly office; and they have then deduced the further conclusion, that since it was impossible for St. John to have made this blunder, it was therefore impossible that he could be the author of this Gospel. Certainly, any one who described it as this yearly office would betray an ignorance with which it would be absurd to credit the Apostle. It is

[1] His proper name was Joseph. That other name by which he is better known he probably assumed with his assumption of the High Priesthood (Josephus, *Antt.* xviii. 2. 2; xviii. 4. 2). The High Priests were wont, on their election, to change their name, as the Popes do now.

[2] Ἀγριώτερον, *B. J.* ii. 8. 14.

quite true that the High Priesthood at this time was by the Romans as vilely prostituted as, under very similar circumstances, the Patriarch's throne at Constantinople is now by the Turks. It was their policy that this, the middle point of Jewish national life, should be weakened and discredited as much as possible. The office was by them shifted from one to another so rapidly, as sometimes to remain with the same holder even for less than a year; but it was still, according to its institution, a lifelong office, was retained by many, if not for a lifetime, yet for many years; as by Caiaphas himself, who held it for more than ten years.[1] But they must be hardly set to find arguments against the authenticity of St. John's Gospel, who have recourse to this. Keim, himself a rationalist, acknowledges that there is nothing in it. If some historian were to write that Abraham Lincoln was President of the United States that same year in which the great civil war broke out, would any be justified in imputing to him the mistake that the Presidency was an annual office, or in concluding that the writer could not have been an American living at the time, and to whom the ordinary sources of information were open? And who has a right to ascribe to the words of St. John any further meaning than that Caiaphas was High Priest *then*? whether he had been so before, or should be after, was nothing to his present purpose. It is significant to the Evangelist that he was this when he spake these words, obtaining as thus they did a weight and importance which else they would not have possessed. They were not the words of Caiaphas; they were the words of the High Priest:[2] '*This spake he not of himself; but being High Priest that year, he prophe-*

[1] He was the fifth High Priest whom Valerius Gratus during a procuratorship of not more than eleven years, had appointed. Four others had in rapid succession been deposed by him (Josephus, *Antt.* xviii. 2. 2; Eusebius, *H. E.* i. 10). Compare Schürer, *Lehrbuch der N. T. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 411.

[2] Bengel: Ubique occurrit Johannes interpretationi sinistræ.

sied that Jesus should die for that nation.' This oracular, even prophetic, character which his utterance thus obtained requires some explanation. That a bad man should utter words which were so overruled by God as to become prophetic, would of itself be no difficulty. He who used a Balaam to declare that a Star should come out of Jacob and a Sceptre rise out of Israel (Num. xxiv. 17), might have used Caiaphas to fore-announce other truths of his kingdom.[1] Nor is there any difficulty in such *unconscious* prophecies as this evidently is.[2] How many prophecies of a like kind,—most of them, it is true, rather in act than in word,—meet us in the whole history of the crucifixion! What was the title over our blessed Lord, 'Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews,' but another such scornful and contemptuous, yet most veritable, prophecy? Or what, again, the purple robe and the homage, the sceptre and the crown? The Roman soldiers did not mean to fulfil the 22nd Psalm when they parted Christ's garments among them, and cast lots upon his vesture; nor the Jewish mockers, the Chief Priests and Scribes, when they wagged their heads and spoke those taunting words against Him; but they did so not the less. And in the typical rehearsals of the crowning catastrophe in the drama of God's providence, how many a Nimrod and Pharaoh and Antiochus and Nero, Antichrists that do not quite come to the birth, have prophetic prefigurative parts allotted to them, which they play out, unknowing

[1] Augustine, adducing this prophecy, exclaims (*Serm.* cccxv. 1): Magna vis est veritatis. Oderunt veritatem homines, et veritatem prophetant nescientes. Non agunt, sed agitur de illis. Calvin: Fuit ergo tunc quasi bilinguis Caiaphas. Impium enim et crudele negandi Christum consilium, quod in animo conceptum habuit, evomuit; Deus vero linguam ejus alio flexit, ut sub ambiguis verbis vaticinium simul proferret. Voluit autem Deus ex sede pontificiâ manare divinum oraculum.

[2] It exactly answers as such to the *omina* of Roman superstition, in which words spoken by one person in a lower meaning are taken up by another in a higher, and by him claimed to be prophetic of that. Cicero (*De Divin.* i. 46) gives examples; these, too, resting on the faith that men's words are ruled by a higher power than their own.

what they do; for such is the divine irony; so, in a very deep sense of the words,

Ludit in humanis divina potentia rebus.[1]

But the perplexing circumstance is the attribution to Caiaphas, because he was *High Priest*, of these prophetic words—for prophetic the Evangelist plainly pronounces them to be, and all attempts to rid his words of this intention, and to destroy the antithesis between '*speaking of himself*' and '*prophesying*,' are idle.[2] There is no need, however, to suppose (and this greatly diminishes the embarrassment) that he meant to affirm this to have been a power inherent in the High Priesthood; that the High Priest, as such, *must* prophesy; but only that God, the extorter of those unwilling, or even unconscious, prophecies from wicked men, ordained this further, that he in whom the whole theocracy culminated, who was 'the Prince of the people' (Acts xxiii. 5), for such, till another High Priest had sanctified Himself,—and his moral character was nothing to the point,—Caiaphas truly was,—should, because he bore this office, be the organ of this memorable prophecy concerning Christ and the meaning and end of his death.[3]

[1] We have an example of this in the very name Caiaphas, which is only another form of Cephas, being derived from the same Hebrew word. He was meant to be what Eusebius, with reference to the *peace-making* activity of Irenæus (εἰρηναῖος) in the Church, calls *him*, φερώνυμος. He should have been 'the Rock;' here too, as in names like Stephen's (στέφανος, the first winner of the martyr's *crown*), the *nomen et omen* was to have held good. And such, had he been true to his position, had the Jewish economy passed easily and without a struggle into that for which it was the preparation, he would naturally have been; the first in the one would have been first in the other. As it was, he bore this name but in mockery; he was the rock indeed, but the rock on which not the Church of Christ, but the synagogue of Satan, was built.—In the Syrian Church there are curious legends of the after life of Caiaphas, and his conversion to the faith (Thilo, *Cod. Apocryphus*, p. xxix).

[2] Wolf (*Curæ*, in loc.) gives some of these.

[3] Vitringa (*Obss. Sac.* vi. 11): Visus est Caiaphas Joanni fatidicum et ominosum quid proferre. Et vere sententia ejus hujusmodi est, ut altiorem aliquem sensum condat. . . . Supponit igitur Apostolus non fuisse alienum a Pontifice Hebræorum illo tempore προφητεύειν, oracula fundere,

What follows, '*And not for that nation*[1] *only, but that also He should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad*,'[2] is not a meaning legitimately involved in the words of Caiaphas, but is added by St. John, careful to disallow that limitation of the benefits of Christ's death, which otherwise they might seem to involve. So grave a misinterpretation, now that the words had been adopted as more than man's, it was well worth while to avert. Caiaphas indeed prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation, and (St. John himself adds) He indeed died not for that nation only, but also for the gathering in one of *all* the children of God scattered abroad through the whole world (cf. Isai. xlix. 6; lvi. 6–8). Elsewhere he has declared the same truth: 'He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world' (1 John ii. 2). Not the law, as the Jews supposed, but the atoning death of Christ, should bind together all men into one fellowship: 'I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me.' The law was no bond of union, rather a wall of separation. It was only

et nescium etiam mandata Numinis profari. A Pontifice, inquam, hoc solum respectu Deo commendabili, quod Pontifex esset; cum ceteroquin personæ ejus nulla essent merita, quæ facere poterant, ut Deus illius rationem haberet. Sed cum Deus Pontifices constituisset in illâ gente, publicos suæ legis voluntatisque interpretes, etiamsi eos in universum propterea neutiquam exemisset omni errore judicii in re religionis; placuit illi Caiaphæ Pontificis potius quam ullius alterius Assessoris linguam in dicendâ sententiâ ita moderari, ut, præter animi sui consilium, de necessitate et vero fine mortis Christi sapienter loqueretur, veramque ederet confessionem, ac si non tanquam Caiaphas sententiam pronuntiâsset.—On the special illumination vouchsafed to the High Priest as bearer of the ephod, see Bähr, *Symbolik*, vol. ii. p. 136; and on the *προφητεύειν*, as belonging to him, see Josephus, *Antt.* xiii. 10. 7.

[1] Very remarkable in St. John's taking up of the words of Caiaphas is the substitution upon his part of *ἔθνος* for the *λαός* which the other had used. The Jews were still the *λαός* in the eyes of the High Priest; not so in those of St. John. This title had been forfeited by them. There was another *λαός* now, even that which had once been *οὐ λαός* (1 Pet. ii. 10; Rev. xviii. 4; xxi. 3); and *they* were henceforth but an *ἔθνος*, as the other *ἔθνη* of the world (see my *Synonyms of the N. T.* § 98).

[2] As Westcott says well: 'The term "scattered abroad" marks a broken unity, and not only wide dispersion.'

that death, and the life which sprang out of that death, which could knit together. We have at Ephes. ii. 13–22, St. Paul's commentary on these words of St. John. '*The children of God*' have this name by anticipation here; they are those predestinated to this sonship; who, not being disobedient to the heavenly calling, should hereafter *become* his children by adoption and grace.[1] So too, in a parallel passage, Christ says, 'Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold' (John x. 16), others, that is, which should be hereafter his sheep; He has 'much people' in Corinth (Acts xviii. 10), many, that is, who shall be hereafter obedient to the faith. In a subordinate sense they might be termed '*children of God*' already; they were the nobler natures, although now run wild, among the heathen, the 'sons of peace,' that should receive the message of peace (Luke x. 6); in a sense, 'of the truth,' even while they were sharing much of the falsehood round them; so far 'of the truth,' that, when the King of truth came and lifted up his banner in the world, they gladly ranged themselves under it (John xviii. 37; cf. Luke viii. 15; John iii. 19–21; Rom. ii. 14).

In pursuance of this advice of Caiaphas it came now to a solemn resolution on the part of the Sanhedrim, that Jesus should die. '*Then from that day forth they took counsel together for to put Him to death.*' There had been purposes and schemes among 'the Jews,' that is, the Pharisees and their adherents, to put Him to death before (Matt. xii. 14; John v. 16, 18; vii. 1, 19, 25; viii. 37); but it was now the formal resolution of the chief Council of the nation (cf. Matt. xxi. 46).[2] All that now remained was to devise the fittest means for bringing this about. '*Jesus, therefore, walked no more openly among the Jews* (cf. Deut. xxxii. 20), *but went thence unto a country near to the wilderness*,' the wilderness, that is, which is mentioned

[1] Augustine, *Ep.* clxxxvii. 12.

[2] Cornelius a Lapide: Vita Lazari, mors Christi.

Josh. viii. 15, 24; xvi. 1; xviii. 12;—'*into a city called Ephraim*,[1] *and there continued with his disciples*,'—not indeed for long, for '*the Jews' Passover was nigh at hand*,' and He, the very Paschal Lamb of that Passover, must not be wanting at the feast.

In the ancient Church there was ever found, besides the literal, an allegorical interpretation of this and the two other miracles of the like kind. As Christ raises those that are naturally dead, so also He quickens them that are spiritually dead; and the history of this miracle, as it abounds the most in details, so was it the most fruitful field on which the allegorists expatiated the most freely. Here they found the whole process of the sinner's restoration from the death of sin to a perfect spiritual life shadowed forth; and these allegories are often rich in manifold adaptations of the history, as beautiful as they are ingenious, to that which it is made to declare.[2] Nor was this all; for these three raisings from the dead were often contemplated not apart, not as each portraying exactly the same truth; but in their connexion with one another, as setting forth one and the same truth under different and successive aspects. It was observed how we have the record of three persons that were restored to life,—one, the daughter of Jairus, being raised *from the bed*; another, the son of the widow, *from the bier*; and lastly, Lazarus *from the grave*. And in the same way Christ raises to newness of life sinners of all degrees; not only those who have just fallen away from truth and holiness, like the damsel who had just expired, and in whom, as with a taper newly extinguished, it was by comparison easy to kindle a vital flame anew; but He

[1] This Ephraim is considered identical with that mentioned at 2 Chron. xiii. 19; see Ritter, *Palestine*, Engl. Transl. vol. iv. p. 225; and Robinson, *Biblical Researches*, vol. i. p. 444. It is called in Josephus a πολίχνιον (*B. J.* iv. 9. 9).

[2] See, for instance, Augustine, *Quæst.* lxxxiii. qu. 65; Bernard, *De Assum. Serm.* iv.

raises also them who, like the young man borne out to his burial, have been some little while dead in their trespasses. Nor has He even yet exhausted his power; for He quickens them also who, like Lazarus, have lain long festering in their sins, as in the corruption of the grave, who were not merely dead, but buried,—with the stone of evil customs and evil habits laid to the entrance of their tomb, and seeming to forbid all egress thence.[1] Even this stone He rolls away, and bids them to come forth, loosing the bands of their sins[2] so that presently they are sitting down with the Lord at that table, there where there is not the foul odour of the grave, but where the whole house is full of the sweet fragrance of the ointment of Christ (John xii. 1–3). All this Donne has well expressed: 'If I be dead within doors (if I have sinned in my heart), why *suscitavit in domo*, Christ gave a resurrection to the ruler's daughter within doors, in the house. If I be dead in the gate (if I have sinned in the gates of my soul), in my eyes, or ears, or hands in actual sins, why *suscitavit in portâ*, Christ gave a resurrection to the young

[1] Gregory the Great (*Moral.* xxii. 15): Veni foras; ut nimirum homo in peccato suo mortuus, et per molem malæ consuetudinis jam sepultus, quia intra conscientiam suam absconsus jacet per nequitiam, a semetipso foras exeat per confessionem. Mortuo enim, Veni foras, dicitur, ut ab excusatione atque occultatione peccati ad accusationem suam ore proprio exire provocetur (2 Sam. xii. 13). Thus too Hildebert, in his sublime hymn, *De SS. Trinitate* (see my *Sacred Latin Poetry*, 3rd edit. p. 335):

Extra portam jam delatum,
Jam fœtentem, tumulatum,
Vitta ligat, lapis urget;
Sed si jubes, hic resurget.

Jube, lapis revolvetur,
Jube, vitta dirumpetur.
Exiturus nescit moras,
Postquam clamas, Exi foras.

A fine sermon or homily in Massillon's *Carême* is just the unfolding of these lines.

[2] The stone, for Augustine, is the law (*In Ev. Joh. tract.* xlix.): Quid est ergo, Lapidem removete? Littera occidens, quasi lapis est premens. Removete, inquit, lapidem. Removete legis pondus, gratiam prædicate. '*Loose him, and let him go*,' he refers to release from Church censures; it was Christ's word which quickened the dead, who yet used the ministration of men to restore entire freedom of action to him whom He had quickened (*Enarr. in Ps.* ci. 21; *Serm.* xviii. 6): Illè suscitavit mortuum, illi solverunt ligatum.

man at the gate of Nain. If I be dead in the grave (in customary and habitual sins), why *suscitavit in sepulcro*, Christ gave a resurrection to Lazarus in the grave too.' [1]

[1] The other raisings from the dead nowhere afford subjects to early Christian Art; but this often, and in all its stages. Sometimes Martha kneels at the feet of Jesus; sometimes the Lord touches with his wonder-staff the head of Lazarus, who is placed upright (which is a transfer of Egyptian customs to Judæa), and rolled up as a mummy (which was nearly correct), in a niche of the grotto; sometimes he is coming forth at the word of the Lord (Münter, *Sinnbilder d. Alt. Christ.* vol. ii. p. 98).

30. THE OPENING OF THE EYES OF TWO BLIND MEN NEAR JERICHO.

MATT. xx. 29–34; MARK x. 46–52; LUKE xviii. 35–43.

THE adjusting of the several records of this miracle has put the ingenuity of harmonists to the stretch. St. Matthew commences his report of it as follows: '*And as they departed from Jericho, a great multitude followed Him. And behold, two blind men, sitting by the wayside, when they heard that Jesus passed by, cried out, saying, Have mercy on us, O Lord, Thou Son of David.*' Thus, according to him, there are two blind, just as in his Gospel there are two demoniacs in the country of the Gadarenes and only one in the other Gospels (Matt. viii. 28); and the miracle is wrought as the Lord is departing from Jericho. St. Luke appears at first sight partially to contradict one of these statements, and wholly the other; for him the healed is but *one*; and Christ effects his cure not as He is quitting, but at his *coming* nigh to, the city. St. Mark occupies a middle place, holding in part with one of his fellow Evangelists, in part with the other; with St. Luke he names one only who was healed; with St. Matthew he places the miracle, not at the entering into, but the going out from, Jericho; so that the three narratives in a way as curious as it is perplexing cross and interlace one another. To escape all the difficulties thus presented to us, there is the convenient suggestion always at hand, that the sacred historians are recording different events; and that therefore there is really no difficulty and nothing to reconcile.

But in fact we do not thus escape embarrassments; we only exchange one for another. Accepting this solution, we must believe that in the immediate neighbourhood of Jericho, our Lord was thrice besought in almost the same words by blind beggars on the wayside for mercy;—that on all three occasions there was a multitude accompanying Him, who sought to silence the voices of the claimants, but only caused them to cry the more earnestly;—that in each case Jesus stood still and demanded what they wanted;—that in each case they made the same reply in very nearly the same words;—and a great deal more.[1] All this is so unnatural, so unlike anything in actual life, so different from the infinite variety which the incidents of the Gospels elsewhere present, that for myself I should prefer almost any explanation to this.

The three apparently discordant accounts, no one of them entirely agreeing with any other, can at once be reduced to two by that rule, which in all reconciliations of parallel histories must be applied, namely, that the silence of one narrator is in itself no contradiction of the affirmation of another; thus the second[2] and the third Evangelist, making mention of *one* blind man, do not contradict St. Matthew, who mentions *two*. There remains only the circumstance that by one Evangelist the healing is placed at the Lord's entering into the city, by the others at his going out. We may not be able to account for the discrepancy, but it does not justify a duplication of the

[1] Some in old times and new have counted themselves shut in to this conclusion:—thus Augustine (*De Cons. Evang.* ii. 65); Lightfoot (*Harmony of the New Testament*, sect. 69); and Greswell. On the other hand, Theophylact, Chrysostom, Maldonatus, Grotius, have with more or less confidence maintained that we have here the same event.

[2] Augustine (*De Cons. Evang.* ii. 65): Procul dubio itaque Bartimæus iste Timæi filius ex aliquâ magnâ felicitate dejectus, notissimæ et famosissimæ miseriæ fuit, quod non solum cæcus, verum etiam mendicus sedebat. Hinc est ergo quod ipsum solum voluit commemorare Marcus, cujus illuminatio tam claram famam huic miraculo comparavit, quam erat illius nota calamitas. Cf. *Quæst. Evang.* ii. 48, where he proposes another solution.

fact. Bengel's suggestion[1] may perhaps be the right one, namely that one cried to the Lord as He drew near to the city,[2] whom yet He cured not then, but on the morrow at his going out of the city cured him together with the other, to whom in the mean while he had joined himself. St. Matthew will then relate by anticipation, as is often the way with historians, the whole of the event there where he first introduces it, rather than, by cutting it in two halves, and deferring his report of the conclusion, preserve a more painful accuracy, yet lose the effect which the complete history related at a breath would possess.

It will be most convenient to myself, and not to myself only, if under the circumstances of the case I follow here the same course which I followed in treating of the demoniacs in the country of the Gadarenes. I there dealt with a single case, and will now do the same. The record of this miracle which St. Mark has preserved for us, as the fullest, as possessing more than one feature which adds picturesqueness to the narrative, will best serve our turn. We read then in the second Gospel, '*As He went out of Jericho with his disciples and a great number of people, blind Bartimæus, the son of Timæus, sat by the highway side, begging.*' We note here St. Mark's acquaintance with the name of the blind man and the name of his father, just as he knows, a little further, that Simon of Cyrene was 'father

[1] Bengel: Marcus unum commemorat Bartimæum, insigniorem (x. 46), eundemque Lucas (xviii. 35) innuit, qui transponendæ historiæ occasionem exinde habuit, quod cæcorum alter, Jesu Hierichuntem intrante, in viâ notitiam divini hujus medici acquisivit. Salvator dum apud Zacchæum pranderet, vel pernoctaret potius, Bartimæo cæcorum alter, quem Matthæus adjungit, interim associatus est. Maldonatus had already fallen upon the same reconciliation.

[2] Grotius will have it that St. Luke's ἐν τῷ ἐγγίζειν here need not, and does not, mean, When He was *drawing near to*, but, When He was *in the neighbourhood of*,—and that this his nearness to the city was that of one who had just departed *from*, not of one who was now approaching *to*, it. But, granting that this were admitted, the notice of Zaccheus which follows is irreconcilable with the assumption that Christ was now *quitting* Jericho.

of Alexander and Rufus' (xv. 21). In all likelihood Bartimæus having been drawn by this gracious dealing of the Lord into the circle of his disciples, was sufficiently well known in the Church to make it a matter of interest to many that he and no other was the object of his healing power. In any event the mention of the fact is interesting to us, testifying, so far as it goes, to that independent character in the second Gospel which is sometimes denied to it.

'*And when he heard that it was Jesus of Nazareth, he began to cry out, and say, Jesus, Thou Son of David, have mercy on me.*' In the cry with which Bartimæus sought to attract the Lord's pity and help there lay a recognition of his dignity as the Messiah; for this name, '*Son of David*,' was the popular designation of the great expected Prophet (Matt. ix. 27; xxi. 9; xxii. 42; cf. Luke i. 32; Ezek. xxxiv. 23, 24). There was wrapt up in it a double confession of faith, to his power, and to his Person; that He could heal; and this, as *the* Prophet at whose coming the eyes of the blind should be opened, and the ears of the deaf unstopped (Isai. xxix. 18; xxxv. 5). The man blind from his birth (John ix.) yields the same confession, but following, and not preceding his cure, and with intervals between; so that first he acknowledges Him as a prophet (ver. 17), and only later as the Christ (ver. 38). Here the explanation has been sometimes found of what follows: '*And many charged him that he should hold his peace*;' grudging, as has been suggested, to hear given to Jesus titles of honour, which they were not themselves prepared to accord Him.[1] We should in that case have here a parallel to Luke xix. 39; with only the difference that there the Pharisees would have Christ Himself to rebuke those that were

[1] Hilary: Denique eos turba objurgat, quia acerbe a cæcis audiunt quod negabant, Dominum esse David Filium. Compare a remarkable passage in Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* iv. 36) on Christ's allowance of the ascription of this title to Him.

glorifying Him, while here the multitude take the rebuking into their own hands. I cannot look at it in this way. It was quite in the spirit of the envious malignant Pharisees to be vexed with those Messianic salutations: 'Blessed be the King, that cometh in the name of the Lord;' but these well-meaning multitudes, rude and in the main spiritually undeveloped as no doubt they were, were yet exempt from such spiritual malignities. They for the most part sympathize with the Lord and his work (Matt. ix. 8). While others said that his miracles were wrought in the power of Beelzebub, they glorified God because of them. Nor can I doubt that here too out of an intention of honouring Christ they sought to silence this suppliant. He may have been teaching as He went, and they would not have Him interrupted by what they regarded as ill-timed and unmannerly clamours.[1]

But the cry of need is not to be stifled so. On the contrary, '*he cried the more a great deal, Thou Son of David, have mercy on me.*' Many admirable applications of this persistence of his have been made. Is there not here, it has been often asked, the story of innumerable souls? When a man begins to be in earnest about his salvation, to cry that his eyes may be opened, that he may walk in *his* light who is the Light of men, begins to despise the world and all those objects which other men most desire, he will find a vast amount of opposition, and that not from professed enemies of the Gospel of Christ, but from such as seem, like this multitude, to be with Jesus and on his side. Even they will endeavour to stop his mouth, and to hinder any earnest crying to the Lord.[2] And with a picture from

[1] Euthymius: Ἐπεστόμισεν αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐνοχλοῦντας αὐτόν.

[2] Augustine (*Serm.* cccxlix. 5): Reprehensuri sunt nos . . . quasi dilectores nostri, homines seculares, amantes terram, sapientes pulverem, nihil de cælo ducentes, auras liberas corde, nare carpentes: reprehensuri sunt nos procul dubio, atque dicturi, si viderint nos ista humana, ista terrena contemnere: Quid pateris? quid insanis? Turba illa est contradicens, ne cæcus clamet. Et aliquanti Christiani sunt, qui prohibent

the life, Augustine makes further application of what follows. Arrested as ever by the cry of need, '*Jesus stood still, and commanded him to be called*;' whereupon, as we read, '*they call the blind man, saying unto him, Be of good comfort, rise; He calleth thee.*' This too, he observes, repeats itself continually in the life of God's saints. If a man will only despise and overbear these obstacles from a world which calls itself Christian; if, despite of all opposers, he will go on, until Christ is evidently and plainly with him, then those same who at the first checked and reprehended, will in the end applaud and admire; they who at first exclaimed, 'He is mad,' will end with exclaiming, 'He is a saint.'[1]

vivere Christiane, quia et illa turba cum Christo ambulabat, et vociferantem hominem ad Christum ac lucem desiderantem, ab ipsius Christi beneficio prohibebat. Sunt tales Christiani, sed vincamus illos, vivamus bene, et ipsa vita sit vox nostra ad Christum. Again, *Serm.* lxxxviii. 13, 14: Incipiat mundum contemnere, inopi sua distribuere, pro nihilo habere quæ homines amant, contemnat injurias, . . . si quis ei abstulerit sua, non repetat; si quid alieni abstulerit, reddat quadruplum. Cum ista facere cœperit, omnes sui cognati, affines, amici commoventur. Quid insanis? Nimius es: numquid alii non sunt Christiani? Ista stultitia est, ista dementia est. Et cetera talia turba clamat, ne cæci clament. . . . Bonos Christianos, vere studiosos, volentes facere præcepta Dei, Christiani mali et tepidi prohibent. Turba ipsa quæ cum Domino est prohibet clamantes, id est, prohibet bene operantes, ne perseverando sanentur. Gregory the Great gives it another turn (*Hom.* ii. *in Evang.*): Sæpe namque dum converti ad Dominum post perpetrata vitia volumus, dum contra hæc eadem exorare vitia quæ perpetravimus, conamur, occurrunt cordi phantasmata peccatorum quæ fecimus, mentis nostræ aciem reverberant, confundunt animum, et vocem nostræ deprecationis premunt. Quæ præibant ergo, increpabant eum, ut taceret. . . . In se, ut suspicor, recognoscit unusquisque quod dicimus: quia dum ab hoc mundo animum ad Deum mutamus, dum ad orationis opus convertimur, ipsa quæ prius delectabiliter gessimus, importuna postea atque gravia in oratione nostrâ toleramus. Vix eorum cogitatio manu sancti desiderii ab oculis cordis abigitur; vix eorum phantasmata per pœnitentiæ lamenta superantur.

[1] Augustine (*Serm.* lxxxviii. 17): Cum quisque Christianus cœperit bene vivere, fervere bonis operibus, mundumque contemnere, in ipsâ novitate operum suorum patitur reprehensores et contradictores frigidos Christianos. Si autem perseveraverit, et eos superaverit perdurando, et non defecerit a bonis operibus, iidem ipsi jam obsequentur, qui ante prohibebant. Tamdiu enim corripiunt et perturbant et vetant, quamdiu sibi cedi posse præsumunt. Si autem victi fuerint perseverantiâ proficientium, convertunt se et dicere incipiunt, Magnus homo, sanctus homo, felix cui Deus concessit. Honorant, gratulantur, benedicunt, laudant; quomodo

It fared exactly thus, for example, with St. Francis of Assisi.

'*And he, casting away his garment,*' ridding himself, that is, of every incumbrance,[1] '*rose and came to Jesus.*' In this his ridding himself of all that would have hindered, he has been often held forth as an example for every soul which Jesus has called, that it should in like manner lay aside every weight and every besetting sin (Matt. xiii. 44, 46; Phil. iii. 7). The Lord's question, '*What wilt thou that I shall do unto thee?*' is, in part, an expression of his readiness to aid, a comment in act upon his own words, spoken but a little while before, 'The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister' (Matt. xx. 28); it is in part intended to evoke into livelier exercise the faith and expectation of the petitioner (Matt. ix. 28). The man, whose cry has been hitherto a vague indeterminate cry for mercy, now singles out the blessing which he craves, designates the channel in which he desires that his mercy should run,[2] '*Lord, that I may receive my sight.*' Only St. Matthew mentions that He *touched* the eyes which should be restored to vision (cf. ix. 29), and only St. Luke the word of power, '*Receive thy sight,*' by which the restoration was effected; while he and St. Mark record nearly similar words, passed over by St. Matthew: '*Thy faith hath made thee whole*'—'*Thy faith hath saved thee*' (cf.

illa turba quæ cum Domino erat. Ipsa prohibebat ne cæci clamarent; sed postquam illi ita clamaverunt, ut mererentur audiri, et impetrare misericordiam Domini, ipsa turba rursum dicit, Vocat vos Jesus. Jam et hortatores fiunt, qui paulo ante corripiebant ut tacerent.

[1] Thus Homer, *Il.* ii. 183: Βῆ δὲ θέειν, ἀπὸ δὲ χλαῖναν βάλε: and in *Phædrus*, v. fab. 2: Stringitque gladium, dein *rejectâ penulâ*; cf. Suetonius, *August.* 26.

[2] Gregory the Great (*Hom.* ii. *in Evang.*), commenting on this request of theirs, bids us, in like manner, to *concentrate* our petitions on the chief thing of all: Non falsas divitias, non terrena dona, non fugitivos honores a Domino, sed *lucem* quæramus: nec lucem quæ loco clauditur, quæ tempore finitur, quæ noctium interruptione variatur, quæ a nobis communiter cum pecoribus cernitur: sed lucem quæramus, quam videre cum solis Angelis possimus, quam nec initium inchoat, nec finis angustat.

Matt. ix. 22; Mark ix. 23; Luke xvii. 19). The man, who had hitherto been tied as to one place, now uses aright his new found faculty of free motion, for he uses it to follow Jesus in the way, at the same time with free outbreaks of a thankful heart, himself '*glorifying God*' (cf. Luke xiii. 13, 17; xvii. 15), and being the occasion no less that '*all the people, when they saw it, gave praise unto God*' as well (Matt. ix. 8; Luke xiii. 17; Acts iii. 8–10).[1]

[1] Godet: Δοξάζειν se rapporte à la puissance, αἰνεῖν à la bonté de Dieu. The poetic αἶνος occurs only here (Luke xviii. 43), and at Matt. xxi. 16: there in a quotation from the Septuagint.

31. *THE CURSING OF THE BARREN FIG-TREE.*

Matt. xxi. 18–22; Mark xi. 12–14, 20–24.

THIS miracle was wrought upon the Monday in Passion week. On the Sunday of Palms Christ had made his triumphal entry into Jerusalem, and in the evening,—for his 'hour,' though close at hand, was not come,—He retired from the snares and perils of the city to the safer Bethany, to the house, probably, of the sisters whom He had so lately made rich with the restoration of a beloved brother, and there lodged. On the Monday morning, as He was returning from Bethany to his ministry in the city very early, indeed before sunrise, the word against the fig-tree was spoken. That same evening He with his disciples went back to Bethany to lodge there, but probably at so late an hour that the darkness prevented these from marking the effects which had followed upon that word. It was not till the morning of Tuesday that '*they saw the fig-tree dried up from the roots.*' Such is the exact order of events, in the telling of which St. Mark shows himself a more accurate observer of times and of the actual sequence of events than the first Evangelist.

But while such differences as their several narratives offer are easily set at one, and they who magnify them into serious difficulties are the true Pharisees of history, straining at gnats and swallowing camels, there are perplexities in this narrative of another kind, such as we are bound not to evade. Let us address ourselves to these: '*Now in the morning, as He returned into the city, He*

hungered. And when He saw a fig-tree in the way, He came to it, and found nothing thereon but leaves only, and said unto it, Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward for ever. And presently the fig-tree withered away.' I said there were difficulties here. Thus how should our Lord, knowing, as by his divine power He must, that there was no fruit upon that tree, have gone to seek it there, made to his disciples as though He had expected to find it? Slight indeed as the insincerity would have been, yet, if it was such, would it not trouble the clearness of our image of Him, whom we conceive as the absolute Lord of truth? Further it is perplexing, that He should thus treat the tree as a moral agent, dealing with it as though unfruitfulness had been guilt upon its part. This, anyhow perplexing, becomes infinitely more so through a notice of St. Mark's; such as indeed the order of the natural year would of itself have suggested, namely, that '*the time of figs was not yet*:' so that at the time when figs could not reasonably be expected,[1] He sought, and was displeased at failing to find, them. For, whatever the undermeaning might have been in treating the tree as a moral agent, and granting such treatment to have been entirely justified, yet all seems again confused and obscured, if the tree could not have been otherwise than without fruit at such a time. For the symbol must needs be carried through; if by a figure we attribute guilt to the tree for not having fruit, we must be consistent, and show that it might have had such, that there was no justifying reason why it should have had none.

Upon the first point, namely that the Lord approached the tree, appearing to expect fruit upon it, and yet knowing that He should find none, deceiving thereby those who were with Him, who no doubt believed that what He professed to look for, He expected to find, it is sufficient

[1] Σῦκον χειμῶνος ζητεῖν, μαινομένου (Marcus Antoninus, xi. 33).

to observe that a similar charge might be made against all figurative teaching, whether by word or by deed: for in all such there is a worshipping of truth in the spirit and not in the letter; often a forsaking of it in the letter, for the better honouring and establishing of it in the spirit. A parable is told *as* true; and though the incidents are feigned, and the persons imagined, it *is* true, because of the moral or spiritual truth which sustains the outward framework of the story; true, because it is the shrine of truth, and because the truth which it enshrines looks through it. Even so a symbolic action is done *as real*, as professing to mean something; and yet, although not meaning the thing which it professes to mean, it is no deception, since it means something infinitely higher and deeper, of which the lower action is a type, and in which that lower is lost; transfigured and transformed by the higher, whereof it is made the vehicle. What was it, for instance, here, if Christ did not intend really to look for fruit on that tree, being aware that it had none? yet He did intend to show how it would fare with a man or with a nation, when God came looking from it for the fruits of righteousness, and found nothing but the abundant leaves of a boastful yet empty profession.[1] As Fuller says, 'He who spake many, here wrought a parable.'

But how, it is asked, shall we justify his putting forth

[1] Augustine (*Quæst. Evang.* ii. 51): Non enim omne quod fingimus mendacium est: sed quando id fingimus, quod nihil significat, tunc est mendacium. Cum autem fictio nostra refertur ad aliquam significationem, non est mendacium, sed aliqua figura veritatis. Alioquin omnia quæ a sapientibus et sanctis viris, vel etiam ab ipso Domino figurate dicta sunt, mendacia deputabuntur, quia secundum usitatum intellectum non subsistit veritas talibus dictis. . . . Sicut autem dicta, ita etiam facta finguntur sine mendacio ad aliquam rem significandam; unde est etiam illud Domini, quod in fici arbore quæsivit fructum eo tempore, quo illa poma nondum essent. Non enim dubium est illam inquisitionem non fuisse veram; quivis enim hominum sciret, si non divinitate, vel tempore, poma illam arborem non habere. Fictio igitur quæ ad aliquam veritatem refertur, figura est; quæ non refertur, mendacium est. Cf. *Serm.* lxxxix. 4-6: Quærit intelligentem, non facit errantem.

of his anger on a tree? Now the real offence which is here taken, at least by many, is that He should have put forth his anger at all; that God should ever show Himself as a punishing God; that there should be any such thing as the having to give account of talents and opportunities, as a day of doom. But seeing that there are such audits, how needful that men should not forget it. Yet they might have forgotten it, as far as the teaching of the miracles wrought by our Lord went, except for this one —all the others being miracles of help and of healing. And even the severity of this, with what mercy was it tempered! Christ did not, like Moses and Elijah, make the assertion of God's holiness and of his hatred of evil at the expense of the lives of many men, but only at the cost of a single unfeeling tree. His miracles of mercy were numberless, and on men; his miracle of judgment was but one, and on a tree.[1]

But then, say some, it was unjust to deal thus with a tree at all, which, being incapable of good or of evil, was as little a fit object of blame as of praise, of punishment as of reward. But this very objection does, in truth, involve that it was *not* unjust, that the tree was a *thing*, which might therefore lawfully be used merely as a means for ends lying beyond itself. Man is the prince of creation, and all things else are to serve him, and then rightly

[1] Hilary (*Comm. in Matt.* in loc.): In eo quidem bonitatis Dominicæ argumentum reperiemus. Nam ubi offerre voluit procuratæ a se salutis exemplum, virtutis suæ potestatem in humanis corporibus exercuit: spem futurorum et animæ salutem curis præsentium ægritudinum commendans: . . . nunc vero, ubi in contumaces formam severitatis constituebat, futuri speciem damno arboris indicavit, ut infidelitatis periculum, sine detrimento eorum in quorum redemptionem venerat, doceretur. Thus too, Grotius: Clementissimus Dominus, quum innumeris miraculis sua in nos æterna beneficia figurâsset, severitatem judicii, quod infrugiferos homines manet, uno duntaxat signo, idque non in homine, sed in non sensurâ arbore, adumbravit; ut certi essemus bonorum operum sterilitatem gratiæ fecundantis ademptione puniri. Theophylact brings out in the same way the *φιλανθρωπία* of this miracle: *ξηραίνει οὖν τὸ δένδρον, ἵνα σωφρονίσῃ ἀνθρώπους.*

fulfil their subordinate uses when they do serve him,—in their life or in their death,—yielding unto him fruit, or warning him in a figure what shall be the penalty and curse of unfruitfulness. Christ did not attribute moral responsibilities to the tree, when He smote it because of its unfruitfulness; but He did attribute to it a fitness for representing moral qualities.[1] All our language concerning trees, a *good* tree, a *bad* tree, a tree which *ought* to bear, is the same continual transfer to them of moral qualities, and a witness for the natural fitness of the Lord's language. It is the language indeed of an act, rather than of words; but by his word (Luke xiii. 6–9)[2] He had already in some sort prepared his disciples for understanding and interpreting his act; and the not un-

[1] Witsius (*Meletem. Leiden.* p. 414) well: At quid tandem commisit infelix arbor, ob quam rem tam inopinato mulctaretur exitio? Si verborum proprietatem sectemur, omnino nihil. Creaturæ enim rationis expertes, uti virtutis ac vitii, ita et præmii ac pœnæ, proprie et stricte loquendo, incapaces sunt. Potest tamen in creaturis istis aliquid existere, quod, analogicâ et symbolicâ quâdam ratione, et vitio et pœnæ respondeat. Defectus fructuum in arbore ceteroquin generosâ, succulentâ, bene plantatâ, frondosâ, multa pollicente, symbolice respondet vitio animi degenerantis, luxuriosi, ingrati, simulati, superbi, verâ tamen virtute destituti; subitanea arboris ex imprecatione Christi arefactio, quâ tollitur quidquid in arbore videbatur esse boni, analogiam quandam habet cum justissimâ Christi vindictâ, quâ in eos animadvertit, qui benignitate suâ abutuntur. Quemadmodum igitur peccata ista hominum vere merentur pœnam, ita κατ' ἀναλογίαν dici potest, arborem, ita uti descripsimus comparatam, mereri exitium.

[2] The fig-tree appears prominently in the New Testament on two occasions; here and at Luke xiii. 6; on neither as the symbol of that which is good. Isidore of Pelusium (in Cramer, *Catena*, in loc.) refers to the old tradition, that it was the tree of temptation in Paradise. For traditions of impurity connected with it, see Tertullian, *De Pudicit.* 6; as Buffon calls it arbre indécent; on which see a learned note in Sepp, *Leben Jesu*, vol. iii. p. 225, seq. Bernard (*In Cant. Serm.* lx. 3): Maledicit ficulneæ pro eo quod non invenit in eâ fructum. Bene ficus, quæ bona licet Patriarcharum radice prodierit, numquam tamen in altum proficere, numquam se humo attollere voluit, numquam respondere radici proceritate ramorum, generositate florum, fecunditate fructuum. Male prorsus tibi cum tuâ radice convenit, arbor pusilla, tortuosa, nodosa. Radix enim sancta. Quid eâ dignum tuis apparet in ramis? The Greek proverbial expressions, σύκινος ἀνήρ, a poor strengthless man, συκίνη ἐπικουρία, unhelpful help, 'succours of Spain,' supply further parallels.

frequent use of this very symbol in the Old Testament, as at Hos. ix. 10; Joel i. 7, must have likewise assisted them here.

Yet, freely admitting all this, it may still be objected, Do not those words of St. Mark, '*for the time of figs was not yet*,' acquit the tree even of this figurative guilt, defeat the symbol, and put it, so to speak, in contradiction with itself? Does it not perplex us in Him, for whom we claim that highest reason should guide his every action, that He should look for figs, when they *could not* be found;—that He should bear Himself as one indignant, when He did not find them? The simplest, and as it appears to me, the entirely satisfying, explanation of this difficulty is the following. At that early period of the year, March or April, neither leaves nor fruit were naturally to be looked for on a fig-tree (the passages often quoted to the contrary not making out, as I think, their point),[1] nor in ordinary

[1] Moreover all explanations which would fain prove that, in the natural order of things, there might have been in Palestine, even at this early season, figs on that tree, winter figs which had survived till spring, or the early figs of the spring itself, seem to me beside the mark. For, be this fact as it may, they shatter upon that οὐ γὰρ ἦν καιρὸς σύκων of St. Mark; from which it is plain that no such calculation of probabilities brought the Lord thither, but those abnormal leaves, which He had a right to count would be accompanied with abnormal fruit. In various ingenious ways it has been sought to make these words *not* to mean what they bear upon their front that they do mean, and so to disembarrass the passage of difficulties which beset it. The most objectionable device of all is the placing of a note of interrogation after σύκων, and making the sacred historian to burst out in an exclamation of wonder at the barrenness of the fig-tree,—'*for was it not the time of figs?*' But the uniform absence of this sort of passionate narration—supplying the reader with his admiration, his wonder, his abhorrence, each ready made—is one of the most striking features of the Gospel story. Scarcely better, though more ingenious, is Daniel Heinsius' suggestion, which has found favour with Knatchbull, Gataker, and others. His help too is in a different pointing and accenting of the passage, as thus, οὗ γὰρ ἦν, καιρὸς σύκων, '*For where He was, it was the season of figs*,'—in the mild climate of Judæa, where, as we know, the fruits of the earth ripened nearly a month earlier than in Galilee. But MSS. and ancient Versions give not the least support; and to express *ibi loci* by οὗ γὰρ ἦν is as awkward and forced as well can be. Deyling (*Obss. Sac.* vol. iii. p. 227), who has Kuinoel, Wetstein, and others on his side, is better. He makes οὐ = οὔπω, and καιρός = tempus

circumstances would any one have sought them there. But that tree, by putting forth leaves, made pretension to

colligendi fructûs, the time for the gathering of the fruit. The harvest had not yet swept away the crop; therefore the Lord could reasonably look for fruit upon the tree; and the words will explain, not the statement '*He found nothing but leaves*,' immediately preceding, but his earlier-mentioned going to the tree, expecting to find fruit thereon. The remoteness of the words to which this clause will then refer is not a fatal objection, for see Mark xvi. 3, 4; and xii. 12, where the words, 'for they knew that He had spoken against them,' account for their seeking to lay hold on Him, not for their fearing the people. But *καιρὸς τῶν καρπῶν* (Matt. xxi. 34; cf. Luke xx. 10), on which the upholders of this scheme greatly rely, means the time of the *ripe* fruits, not the time of the *in-gathered*. Another explanation, which Hammond, D'Outrein, and many more have embraced, makes *καιρός* = *καιρὸς εὔφορος*, and St. Mark to say that it was an unfavourable season for figs. A very old, although almost unnoticed, reading, *ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς οὐκ ἦν σύκων*, might be urged in support of this. But we want examples of *καιρός* as = *καιρὸς εὔφορος*, for Matt. xiii. 30, Luke xx. 10, which are sometimes adduced, do not satisfy. Conscious of this, Olshausen and a writer in the *Theol. Stud. und Krit.* 1843, p. 131, seq., have slightly modified this view. These do not make *καιρός* 'season,' since the season for the chief crop, whether good or bad, had not arrived, and therefore there was no room for expressing a judgment about it; but take it in the sense of weather, temperature: *καιρός* = tempus opportunum. If there had been favourable weather, at once moist and warm, there would have been figs on the tree: not indeed the main crop, but the ficus præcox (see Pliny, *H. N.* xv. 19), the early spring fig, which was counted an especial delicacy ('the figs that are first ripe,' Jer. xxiv. 2), and of which Isaiah speaks (xxviii. 4) as 'the *hasty* fruit *before the summer*, which when he that looketh upon it seeth, while it is yet in his hand he eateth it up' (cf. Hos. ix. 10); or if not these, the late winter fig, which Shaw mentions (Winer, *Realwörterbuch*, s. v. Feigenbaum) as first ripening after the tree has lost its leaves, and hanging on the tree, in a mild season, into the spring. For this use of *καιρός* a passage much to the point has been cited from the *Hecuba* of Euripides (592–595):

> *οὔκουν δεινὸν, εἰ γῆ μὲν κακὴ,*
> *Τυχοῦσα καιροῦ θεόθεν, εὖ στάχυν φέρει,*
> *Χρηστὴ δ', ἁμαρτοῦσ' ὧν χρεὼν αὐτὴν τυχεῖν,*
> *Κακὸν δίδωσι καρπόν.*

Upon this Matthiæ says: Quum *καιρός* omnia complectatur, quæ alicui rei opportuna et consentanea sunt, hoc loco proprie significat omnia ea, quæ agris, ut fructus ferant, accommodata sunt, ut pluviam, cæli commodam temperiem, quo sensu accepisse Euripidem ex adjecto *θεόθεν* patet. Yet allowing all this, there is a long step between it and proving *καιρὸς σύκων* to be = tempus opportunum ficis. See Sir T. Browne, *Obss. upon Plants mentioned in Scripture,—Works*, vol. iv. pp. 162–167.

be something more than others, to have fruit upon it, seeing that in the fig-tree the fruit appears before the leaves.[1] It, so to speak, vaunted itself to be in advance of all the other trees, challenged the passer-by that he should come and refresh himself from it. Yet when the Lord accepted the challenge, and drew near, it proved to be but *as* the others, without fruit as they; for indeed, as the Evangelist observes, the time of figs had not yet arrived,—the fault, if one may use the word, of this tree lying in its pretension, in its making a show to run before the rest, when it did not so indeed. It was condemned, not so much for having no fruit, as that, not having fruit, it clothed itself abundantly with the foliage which, according to the natural order of the tree's development, gave pledge and promise that fruit should be found on it, if sought.

And this will then exactly answer to the sin of Israel, which under this tree was symbolized,—that sin being, not so much that it was without fruit, as that it boasted of having so much. The true fruit of that people, as of any people before the Incarnation, would have been to own that it had no fruit, that without Christ, without the incarnate Son of God, it could do nothing; to have presented itself before God bare and naked and empty altogether. But this was exactly what Israel refused to do. Other nations might have nothing to boast of, but they by their own showing had much.[2] And yet on closer inspection, the substance of righteousness was as much wanting on their part as anywhere among the nations round (Rom. ii. 1; Matt. xxi. 33–43).

And how should it have been otherwise? '*for the time of figs was not yet*;'—the time for the bare stock and stem of

[1] Pliny (*H. N.* xvi. 49): Ei demum serius folium nascitur quam pomum.

[2] It is not a little remarkable that it was with the fig-leaves that in Paradise Adam attempted to deny his nakedness, and to present himself as other than a sinner before God (Gen. iii. 7).

humanity to array itself in bud and blossom, with leaf and fruit, had not come, till its engrafting on the nobler stock of the true Man. All which anticipated this, which seemed to say that it could *be* anything, or *do* anything, otherwise than in Him and by Him, was deceptive and premature. The other trees had nothing, but then they did not pretend to have anything; this tree had nothing, but it gave out that it had much. So was it severally with Gentile and with Jew. The Gentiles were empty of all fruits of righteousness, but they owned it; the Jews were empty, but they vaunted that they were full. The Gentiles were sinners, but the Jews hypocrites and pretenders to boot, and by so much farther from the kingdom of God, and more nigh unto a curse.[1] Their guilt was not that they had not the perfect fruits of faith, for the time of such had not yet arrived; but that, not having, they so boastfully gave out that they had: their condemnation was, not that they were not healed, but that, being unhealed, they counted themselves whole. The law would have done its work, the very work for which God ordained it, if it had stripped them of these boastful leaves, or indeed had hindered from ever putting them forth (Rom. v. 20).

Here then, according to this explanation, there is no difficulty either in the Lord's going to the tree at that unseasonable time,—He would not have gone, but for those deceitful leaves which announced that fruit was there,—nor in the (symbolic) punishment of the unfruitful tree at a season of the year when, according to the natural order, it could not have had any. It was punished not for being without fruit, but for proclaiming by the voice of those leaves that it had fruit; not for being barren, but for being false. And this was the guilt of Israel, a guilt so much

[1] Witsius (*Meletem. Leiden.* p. 415): Folia sunt jactatio legis, templi, cultûs, cærimoniarum, pietatis denique et sanctimoniæ, quarum se specie valde efferebant. Fructus sunt resipiscentia, fides, sanctitas, quibus carebant.

deeper than the guilt of the nations. The Epistle to the Romans supplies the key to the right understanding of this miracle; such passages as ii. 3, 17–27; x. 3, 4, 21; xi. 7, 10, above all. Nor should that remarkable parallel, 'And all the trees of the field shall know that I the Lord have dried up the green tree, and made the dry tree to flourish' (Ezek. xvii. 24), be left out of account.[1] And then the sentence, '*No man eat fruit of thee hereafter for ever*,' will be just the reversal of the promise that in them all nations of the earth should be blessed—the symbolic counterstroke to the ratification of the Levitical priesthood through the putting forth, by Aaron's rod, of bud and blossom and fruit in a night (Num. xvii. 8). Henceforth the Jewish synagogue is stricken with a perpetual barrenness.[2] Once it was everything, but now it is nothing, to the world; it stands apart, like 'a thing forbid;' what little it has, it communicates to none; the curse has come upon it, that no man henceforward shall eat fruit of it for ever.[3]

[1] Some have thought that our Lord alludes to this work of his, when He asks, 'If they do these things in a green tree, what shall be done in the dry?' (Luke xxiii. 31). If thus it fared with Him, 'a green tree,' full of sap, full of life, how should it fare with Israel after the flesh, 'the dry' tree, withered under the curse which He had spoken against it?

[2] Witsius (*Meletem. Leiden.* p. 415): Parabolica ficûs maledictio significavit, futurum esse ut populus Israëliticus justâ Dei indignatione omni vigore et succo spiritualis fecunditatis privetur, et quia fructus bonorum operum proferre isthoc tempore noluit, dein nec possit. Ac veluti maledictionis sententiam ficûs arefactio protinus excepit, sic et Judæorum natio, mox post spretum proterve Messiam, exaruit.

[3] Augustine brings out often and well the figurative character of this miracle;—though, with most expositors, he misses the chief stress of this tree's (symbolic) guilt, namely, its running before its time, and by its leaves proclaiming it had fruit; when its true part and that which the season justified, would have been to present itself with neither. He makes its real barrenness, contrasted with its pomp of leaves, to be the stress of its fault, leaving out of sight the *untimeliness* of those leaves and of that pretence of fruit, which is the most important element in the whole. Thus *Serm.* lxxvii. 5: Etiam ipsa quæ a Domino facta sunt, aliquid significantia erant, quasi verba, si dici potest, visibilia et aliquid significantia. Quod maxime apparet in eo quod præter tempus poma quæsivit in arbore, et quia non invenit, arbori maledicens aridam fecit.

And yet this '*for ever*' has its merciful limitation, when we come to transfer the curse from the tree to that of which the tree was as a living parable; a limitation which the word itself favours and allows; which is latent in it, to be revealed in due time. None shall eat fruit of that tree to the end of the present age, not until these 'times of the Gentiles' are fulfilled. A day indeed will come when Israel, which now says, 'I am a dry tree,' shall consent to that word of its true Lord, which of old it denied: 'from *Me* is thy fruit found' (Hos. xiv. 8), and shall be clothed with the richest foliage and fruit of all the trees of the field. The Lord, in his great discourse upon the last things (Matt. xxiv.), implies as much, when He gives this commencing conversion of the Jews, under the image of the re-clothing of the bare and withered fig-tree with leaf and bud, as the sign of the breaking in of the new æon: 'Now learn a parable of the fig-tree. When his branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh: so likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors' (ver. 32, 33).

We conclude from St. Matthew that some beginnings of the threatened withering began to show themselves, almost as soon as the word of the Lord was spoken; a shuddering fear may have run through all the leaves of the tree thus stricken at its heart: for '*presently the fig-tree withered away.*' But it was not till the next morning, as

Hoc factum nisi figuratum accipiatur, stultum invenitur; primo quæsisse poma in illâ arbore, quando tempus non erat ut essent in ullâ arbore: deinde si pomorum jam tempus esset, non habere poma quæ culpa arboris esset? Sed quia significabat, quærere se non solum folia, sed et fructum, id est, non solum verba, sed et facta hominum, arefaciendo ubi sola folia invenit, significavit eorum pœnam, qui loqui bona possunt, facere bona nolunt. Cf. *Serm.* xcviii. 3: Christus nesciebat, quod rusticus sciebat? quod noverat arboris cultor, non noverat arboris creator? Cum ergo esuriens poma quæsivit in arbore, significavit se aliquid esurire, et aliquid aliud quærere; et arborem illam sine fructu foliis plenam reperit, et maledixit; et aruit. Quid arbor fecerat fructum non afferendo? Quæ culpa arboris infecunditas? Sed sunt qui fructum voluntate dare non

the disciples returned, that they took note of its utter perishing, '*dried up from the roots*,' as now it was: whereupon '*Peter calling to remembrance, saith unto Him: Master, behold, the fig-tree which Thou cursedst is withered away*.' He will not let the occasion go by without its further lesson. What He had done, they might do the same and more. Faith in God would place them in relation with the same powers which He wielded, so that they might do mightier things even than this at which they marvelled so much.[1]

possunt. Illorum est culpa sterilitas, quorum fecunditas est voluntas. Cf. *Con. Faust.* xxii. 25.

[1] It must have been in imitation of this act of his Lord that St. Bernard, quitting the scant hospitality of a castle which bore the name of Viride Folium, and where he had found nothing but resistance to the truth, exclaimed, Viride Folium, desiccet te Deus! which word of his, as his biographer assures us, was not uttered in vain.

32. *THE HEALING OF MALCHUS' EAR.*

LUKE xxii. 49–51.

THE blow struck by a disciple, who would fain have fought for his Master, that He should not be delivered to the Jews, is recorded by all four Evangelists (Matt. xxvi. 51; Mark xiv. 47; Luke xxii. 50; John xviii. 10); but the miracle which followed belongs only to St. Luke. *He* only tells how the Lord made good the injury which his disciple had inflicted, touched and restored the ear which he had cut off. It is possible that a double interest may have specially moved this Evangelist to include in *his* narrative this work of grace and power. As a physician, this cure, sole of its kind which we know of our Lord's performing, the only miraculous healing of a wound inflicted by external violence, would attract his special attention. And then, further, nothing lay nearer to his heart, or cohered more intimately with the purpose of his Gospel, than the portraying of the Lord on the side of his gentleness, his mercy, his benignity; and of all these there was an eminent manifestation in this gracious work wrought on behalf of one who was in arms against his liberty and life.

St. Luke, no doubt, knew very well, though he did not think good to set it down in his narrative, whose hand it was that struck this blow,—whether that the deed might still have brought him into trouble, though this appears an exceedingly improbable explanation, or from some other cause. The two earlier Evangelists preserve a like silence, and are content with generally designating him,—St.

Matthew as '*one of them who were with Jesus*,' St. Mark as '*one of them which stood by*.' It is only from St. John we learn, what perhaps we might otherwise have surmised, but could not certainly have known, that it was Peter who struck the one blow stricken in defence of the Lord. He also tells us what perhaps the other Evangelists did not know, the name of the High Priest's servant who was wounded; '*the servant's name was Malchus*.'[1] It is in entire consistency with all else which we read, that this fact should have come within the circle of St. John's knowledge; for he, in some way not explained to us, was acquainted with the High Priest (John xviii. 15), was so familiar with the constitution of his household that he is able to tell us concerning one, who later in the night provoked Peter to his denial of Christ, that he was 'his kinsman whose ear Peter cut off' (ver. 26).

The whole incident is singularly characteristic; the *word*-bearer for the rest of the Apostles proves, when occasion requires, the *sword*-bearer also—showing himself prompter and more daring in action than them all. While they are inquiring, '*Lord, shall we smite with the sword?*' (Luke xxii. 49) perplexed between the natural instinct of defence, with love to their perilled Lord, on the one side, and his precepts that they should not resist the evil, on the other,—Peter waits not for the answer; but impelled by the natural courage of his heart,[2] and careless of the odds against him, aims a blow at one, probably the foremost of the band, the first that was daring to lay profane hands on the sacred person of his Lord. This was '*a servant of the High Priest*,' one therefore who, according

[1] Josephus mentions more than once an Arabian king of this name, *B. J.* i. 14. 1; *Antiqq.* xiii. 5. 1; xiv. 14. 1; he has found his way by aid of North's *Plutarch* into Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*, act iii. Malchus, which means king, was the proper name of Porphyry, the Neoplatonic philosopher. Longinus, rendering it into Greek, called him Πορφύρεος, or the Purple-wearer.

[2] Josephus characterizes the Galilæans as pugnacious (μάχιμοι).

to the proverb, 'like master like man,' may have been especially forward in this bad work,—himself a Caiaphas of a meaner stamp; a volunteer too on the present occasion, and not, as the '*officers*,'[1] in the execution of his duty. Peter was not likely to strike with other than a right good will; and no doubt the blow was intended to cleave down the aggressor; though by God's good providence the stroke was turned aside, and grazing the head at which it was aimed, but still coming down with sheer descent, cut off the ear,—the '*right ear*,' as St. Luke and St. John tell us,—of the assailant, who thus hardly escaped with his life.

The words with which our Lord rebuked the untimely zeal[2] of his disciple are differently given by different Evangelists, or rather each has given a different portion, each one enough to indicate the spirit in which all was spoken. St. Matthew records them most at length (xxvi. 52–54); while St. Luke passes them over altogether. That moment of uttermost confusion might seem unsuitable for so long a discourse, indeed hardly to have given room for it. We may best suppose that while the healing

[1] He is δοῦλος, not ὑπηρέτης (John xviii. 3). On the difference between these see my *Synonyms of the New Testament*, § 11.

[2] Modern expositors are sometimes much too hard upon this exploit of Peter's; Calvin: Stulto suo zelo Petrus gravem infamiam magistro suo ejusque doctrinæ inusserat,—with much more in this tone. The wisest word upon the matter (and on its Old-Testament parallel, Exod. ii. 12) is Augustine's, *Con. Faust.* xxii. 70. He keeps as far from this unmeasured rebuke as from the extravagance of Romish expositors, who exalt this act as one of a holy indignation; liken it to the act of Phinehas (Num. xxv. 7) by which he won the high priesthood for his family for ever. Leo the Great (*Serm.* L. 4) had led the way: Nam et beatus Petrus, qui animosiore constantiâ Domino cohærebat, et contra violentorum impetus fervore sanctæ caritatis exarserat, in servum principis sacerdotum usus est gladio, et aurem viri ferocius instantis abscidit. Others too, writing in the interests of Rome, find in the command, '*Put up thy sword into his place*,' a sanction for the wielding of the civil sword by the Church; for, as they bid us note, Christ does not say, *Put away* thy sword;' but '*Put up thy sword into his place*,' —that is, 'Keep it in readiness to draw forth again, when the right occasion shall arrive.' Tertullian, in an opposite extreme, concludes from these words that the military service is absolutely unlawful for the Christian (*De Idolol.* 16): Omnem militem Dominus in Petro exarmando discinxit.

of Malchus was proceeding, and all were watching and wondering, the Lord spoke these quieting words to his disciples. Possibly too his captors, who had feared resistance or attempts at rescue on the part of his followers, now when they found that his words prohibited aught of the kind, may have been unwilling to interrupt Him. To Peter, and in him to all the other disciples, He says: '*Put up again thy sword into his place; for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.*' Christ, joining together the taking of the sword and the perishing by the sword, refers, no doubt, to the primal law, 'Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed' (Gen. ix. 6; cf. Rev. xiii. 10). This saying has been sometimes wrongly understood, as though the Lord were pacifying Peter with considerations such as these, 'There is no need for thee to assume the task of punishing these violent men: they have taken the sword, and by the just judgment of God they will perish by the sword.' [1] But the warning against taking the sword connects itself so closely with the command, '*Put up again thy sword into his place,*' and the meaning of the verse following (Matt. xxvi. 53) is so plainly, 'Thinkest thou that I need a feeble help like thine, when, instead of you, twelve weak trembling men, inexpert in war, I might even now at this latest moment *pray to my Father, and He shall presently give Me* [2] *more than twelve legions* [3] *of Angels* to fight on my behalf? [4]—

[1] Thus Grotius: Noli, Petre, consideratione ejus quæ mihi infertur injuriæ concitatior, Deo præripere ultionem. Levia enim sunt vulnera quæ a te pati possunt. Stat enim rata sententia, crudeles istos et sanguinarios, etiam te quiescente, gravissimas Deo daturos pœnas suo sanguine. This interpretation is a good deal older than Grotius. Chrysostom has it; and Euthymius sees in these words a *προφητεία τῆς διαφθορᾶς τῶν ἐπελθόντων αὐτῷ Ἰουδαίων.*

[2] *Παραστήσει μοι* = servitio meo sistet (Rom. vi. 19; xii. 1).

[3] We are reminded here of the *πλῆθος στρατιᾶς οὐρανίου* (Luke ii. 13), and other language of the same kind. Without falling in with the fancies of the Areopagite, we may see intimations here of a hierarchy in heaven. Bengel: Angeli in suos numeros et ordines divisi sunt.

[4] Jerome: Non indigeo duodecim Apostolorum auxilio, qui possum

that all the ingenuity which Grotius and others use, and it is much, to recommend the other interpretation, cannot persuade to its acceptance. This mention of the '*twelve legions of Angels*,' whom it was free to Him to summon to his aid, brings the passage into striking relation with 2 Kin. vi. 17 (cf. 2 Chron. xxxii. 7; Job xxv. 3). A greater than Elisha is here; who, thus speaking, would as with heavenly euphrasy purge the spiritual eye of his troubled disciple, and enable him to see the mount of God, full of chariots and horses of fire, armies of heaven camping round his Lord, which a beck from Him would bring forth, to the utter discomfiture of his enemies. '*But how then shall the Scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be?*' The temptation to claim the assistance of that heavenly host,—supposing Him to have felt the temptation,—is quelled in an instant; for how should that eternal purpose, that will of God, of which Scripture was the outward expression, '*that thus it must be*,' have then been fulfilled? (cf. Zech. xiii. 7). In St. John the same entire subordination of his own will to his Father's, which must hinder Him from claiming this unseasonable help, finds its utterance under another image: '*The cup which my Father hath given Me, shall I not drink it?*' This language is frequent in Scripture, resting on the image of some potion which, however bitter, must yet be drained. Besides Matt. xx. 22, 13; xxvi. 39, where the cup is one of holy suffering, there is often, especially in the Old Testament, mention of

habere duodecim legiones angelici exercitûs. Maldonatus: Mihi quidem verosimile videtur Christum angelos non militibus, sed discipulis opponere, qui duodecim erant, ac propterea duodecim non plures nec pauciores legiones nominâsse, ut indicaret posse se pro duodecim hominibus duodecim legiones habere. The fact that the number of Apostles who were even tempted to draw sword in Christ's behalf was, by the apostasy of Judas, reduced now to eleven, need not remove us from this interpretation. The Lord contemplates them *in their ideal completeness*. He does the same elsewhere: 'Ye shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel' (Matt. xix. 28; cf. Luke xxii. 30)—when, indeed, it was not Judas, but his successor, that should occupy a throne.

the cup of God's anger (Isai. li. 17, 22; Ps. xi. 6; lx. 3; lxxv. 8; Jer. xxv. 15, 17; xlix. 12; Lam. iv. 21; Rev. xiv. 10; xvi. 19); in every case this cup being one from which flesh and blood shrinks back, which a man would fain put away from his lips, though a moral necessity in the case of the godly, and a physical in that of the ungodly, will not suffer it to be thus put aside.

The words that follow, '*Suffer ye thus far*,' are still addressed to the disciples, and not to them who had just laid their hands on the Lord. We may paraphrase them thus, 'Hold now; ye have gone thus far in resistance; but let this suffice.' Having thus checked their too forward zeal, and now in act embodying his own precept, 'Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you,' He touched the ear of the wounded man, '*and healed him*.' Peter and the rest meanwhile, after this brief flash of a carnal courage, forsook their Master, and, leaving Him in the hands of his enemies, fled,—the wonder of the crowd at that gracious healing act, or the tumult with the darkness of the night, or these both together, favouring their evasion.

33. THE SECOND MIRACULOUS DRAUGHT OF FISHES.

JOHN xxi. 1–23.

IT almost seemed as though St. John's Gospel had found its solemn completion in the words with which the twentieth chapter ended; this chapter thus appearing, and probably being, in the exactest sense of the word, *a post-script*,—something which the beloved Apostle, after he had made an end, counted it important not to leave untold; which he added, perhaps, at the request of his disciples, who, having often drunk in the story from his lips, desired that before his departure he should set it down, that the Church might be enriched by it for ever.[1] Or, if we

[1] Doubts of the Johannine authorship of this chapter were first stirred by Grotius; he supposed it to have been added, probably after St. John's decease, by the Ephesian elders, who had often heard the story from his lips. These doubts have little or nothing to warrant them. Unlike another really suspicious passage in St. John's Gospel (viii. 1–11), there is no outward evidence against this. Every MS. and early Version possesses it, nor was there ever a misgiving about it in antiquity. He therefore, and his followers here, Clericus, Semler, Paulus, Gurlitt, Lücke, Schott (*Comm. de Indole Cap. ult. Ev. Joh.* Jen. 1825), Scholten, Credner, Wieseler, De Wette, Baur, can have none but internal evidence to urge, evidence frequently deceptive, and always inconclusive; and here even weaker than usual. Everywhere we recognize the hand of the beloved disciple. Not merely is the whole tone of the narration his;—for that might very well be, were others reporting what he had often told them; but single phrases and turns of language, unobserved till we have motives for observing them, attest his hand. He only uses Τιβεριάς, θάλασσα τῆς Τιβεριάδος (vi. 1, 23) for the lake of Galilee; or παιδία as a word of address from the teacher to the taught (cf. ver. 5 with 1 John ii. 13, 18); πιάζειν, which occurs twice (ver. 3, 10), and on six other occasions in his Gospel, is found only thrice besides in the whole New Testament. Again, ἑλκύειν (ver. 6, 11) is one of his words (vi. 44; xii. 32; xviii. 20), being found elsewhere but once. The double ἀμήν (ver. 18) is exclusively St. John's, occurring twenty-five times in his

regard John i. 1–14 as the prologue, this we might style the epilogue, of his Gospel. As that set forth what the Son of God was before He came from the Father, even so this, in mystical and prophetic guise, how He should rule in the world after He had returned to the Father.

'*After these things Jesus showed*[1] *Himself again to the disciples at the sea of Tiberias.*' St. John alone calls the lake by this name; his motive no doubt being that so it would be more easily recognized by those for whom he especially wrote—Tiberias, built by Herod Antipas in honour of Tiberius, being a city well known to the heathen world.[2] On the first occasion of using this name, he has marked the identity of this lake with the lake of Galilee mentioned by the other Evangelists (vi. 1), but does not count it necessary to repeat this here. There is a significance in the words, '*showed Himself*,' or '*manifested Himself*,' which many long ago observed,—no other than this, that his body after the resurrection was only visible by a distinct act of his will. From that time the disciples did not, as before, *see* Jesus, but Jesus *appeared unto*, or *was seen by, them*. It is not for nothing that in language of this kind all his appearances after the resurrection are related (Mark xvi. 12, 14; Luke xxiv. 34; Acts xiii. 31; 1 Cor. xv. 5–8). It is the same with angelic and all other manifestations of a higher heavenly world. Men do not

Gospel, never elsewhere; and so the appellation of Thomas, Θωμᾶς ὁ λεγόμενος Δίδυμος (ver. 2; cf. xi. 16; xx. 24): compare too ver. 19 with xii. 23 and xviii. 32; the use of ὁμοίως (ver. 13) with the parallel use at vi. 11. Ὀψάριον (ver. 9, 10, 13; cf. vi. 9, 11), and πάλιν δεύτερον (ver. 16; cf. iv. 54), belong only to him; and the narrator interposing words of his own, to avert a misconception of words spoken by the Lord (ver. 19), is in St. John's favourite manner (ii. 21; vi. 6; vii. 39). And of these peculiarities many more might be adduced.

[1] This ἐφανέρωσεν ἑαυτόν of his last miracle St. John no doubt intends us to bring into relation with the ἐφανέρωσε τὴν δόξαν of his first (ii. 11); which being so, the A. V. should have retained, as a hint of this, and as the R. V. indeed has done, the 'manifested' which it there employs. Compare too the taunt of vii. 4: φανέρωσον σεαυτόν: this He is now doing.

[2] Λίμνη Τιβαρίς Pausanias calls it.

see them; such language would be inappropriate; but they *appear* to men (Judg. vi. 12; xiii. 3, 10, 21; Matt. xvii. 3; Luke i. 11; xxii. 43; Acts ii. 3; vii. 2; xvi. 9; xxvi. 16); being only visible to those for whose sakes they are vouchsafed, and to whom they are willing to show themselves.[1] Those to whom this manifestation was vouchsafed are enumerated. They are seven, which is scarcely an accident. '*There were together Simon Peter, and Thomas called Didymus, and Nathanael of Cana in Galilee, and the sons of Zebedee, and two other of his disciples.*' St. John, I need hardly say, has no list of Apostles. This is the nearest approach to one in his Gospel. It makes something for the opinion, unknown to antiquity, but yet so probable, and by some now accepted as certain, that the Nathanael of St. John is the Bartholomew of the other Evangelists, thus to find him named not after, but in the midst of, some of the chiefest Apostles.[2] Who were the two unnamed disciples cannot certainly be known. They also could scarcely be other than Apostles,—a word, it should be remembered, which St. John nowhere uses to designate the Twelve, indeed uses only once (xiii. 16) in all his writings,—'*disciples*' in the most eminent sense of the word. Lightfoot supposes that they were Andrew and Philip; which is very likely; for where Peter was, there his brother Andrew would scarcely be wanting (Matt. iv. 18; Mark i. 29; Luke vi. 14; John vi. 8), and where Andrew there in all likelihood would be Philip as well

[1] Thus Ambrose on the appearing of the Angel to Zacharias (*Exp. in Luc.* i. 24): Bene *apparuisse* dicitur ei, qui eum repente conspexit. Et hoc specialiter aut de Angelis aut de Deo Scriptura divina tenere consuevit; ut quod non potest prævideri, apparere dicatur. . . . Non enim similiter sensibilia videntur, et is in cujus voluntate situm est videri, et cujus naturæ est non videri, voluntatis videri. Nam si non vult, non videtur: si vult, videtur. And Chrysostom here: Ἐν τῷ εἰπεῖν, ἐφανέρωσεν ἑαυτὸν, τοῦτο δηλοῖ, ὅτι εἰ μὴ ἤθελε, καὶ αὐτὸς ἑαυτὸν διὰ συγκατάβασιν ἐφανέρωσεν, οὐχ ὡρᾶτο, τοῦ σώματος ὄντος ἀφθάρτου.

[2] Cardinal Newman in his *Parochial Sermons*, vol. ii. p. 372, has well summed up the arguments in favour of the identity of Bartholomew and Nathanael. See too my *Studies in the Gospels*, 4th ed. p. 84.

(John i. 45; xii. 22; Mark iii. 18). In all other lists of the Apostles the sons of Zebedee occupy a place immediately after Peter (Mark iii. 16, 17; Acts i. 13), or after Peter and Andrew (Matt. x. 2). Here they are the last of those actually named. This is exactly what we might expect, if St. John was the author of this chapter, but it would scarcely otherwise have occurred.

The announcement of Peter, '*I go a-fishing*,' is not, as it has been strangely interpreted, a declaration that he has lost all faith in Jesus as the Messiah, has renounced his apostleship, and, since now there is no nobler work in store for him, will return to his old occupation. A teacher in that new kingdom which his Lord had set up, he is following the wise rule of the Jewish Rabbis, who were ever wont to have some manual trade or occupation on which to fall back in time of need. We all know of what good service to St. Paul was his skill in making tents, what a healthy sense of independence it gave him (2 Thess. iii. 8). Probably too they found it healthful to their own minds, to have some outward employment for which to exchange on occasions their spiritual (Acts xviii. 3). Peter's challenge to the old companions of his toil is at once accepted by them: '*They say unto him, We also go with thee.*' And hereupon '*they went forth, and entered into a ship immediately; and that night they caught nothing.*' It fared with them now, as it had fared with three, or perhaps four, among them on a prior occasion (Luke v. 5). Already a dim feeling may have risen up in their minds that this night should be the spiritual counterpart of that other; and as that was followed by a glorious day, and by their first installation in their high office as 'fishers of men,' this present ill-success may have helped to prepare their spirits for that wondrous glimpse which they were now to receive, of what their work, and what its reward, should be. Had it been, however, more than the obscurest presentiment, they would have been quicker to recognize

their Lord, who, '*when the morning was now come*,' or better, '*when the day was now breaking*,'[1] '*stood on the shore*,' or rather, '*stood on the beach*.' It was an appropriate time; for 'heaviness may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning' (Ps. xxx. 5; cf. xix. 5; cxliii. 8); morning is here, as so often, the type of dawning salvation.[2] Nor was the place less appropriate; He now on the firm land (it had not been so once, Luke v. 1–11), they still on the unquiet sea.[3] As yet, however, their eyes were holden; '*the disciples knew not that it was Jesus*' (cf. xx. 14; Luke xxiv. 16); He was to them but as a stranger, and in the language of a stranger He addressed them; '*Children, have ye any meat?*' putting this question, Chrysostom supposes, as one that would fain have purchased from them of the fruit of their toil: but rather, I should imagine, as with that friendly interest, not unmixed with curiosity, which almost all take in the result of

[1] Westcott. The true reading (γινομένης, not γενομένης) gives the more vivid picture.

[2] There is a sublime reaching out after an expression of this in the opening of the *Electra* of Sophocles. With the arrival of Orestes at his father's house, about to purify that house from the hideous stains of blood, the long night of the triumphing of the wicked is over, and the day of righteous retribution is at hand. With what consummate skill and in what glorious poetry the greatest artist, if not the greatest poet, of the ancient world surrounds his arrival with all the signs and tokens of the dawning day. Thus 17–19:

> ὡς ἡμὶν ἤδη λαμπρὸν ἡλίου σέλας
> ἑῷα κινεῖ φθέγματ' ὀρνίθων σαφῆ,
> μέλαινά τ' ἄστρων ἐκλέλοιπεν εὐφρόνη.

So Calderon calls his grand play on the conversion of Peru, *Daybreak in Copacabana* (*La Aurora en Copacabana*).

[3] Gregory the Great (*Hom.* xxiv.): Quid enim mare nisi præsens seculum signat, quod se causarum tumultibus et undis vitæ corruptibilis illidit? Quid per soliditatem littoris, nisi illa perpetuitas quietis æternæ figuratur? Quia ergo discipuli adhuc fluctibus mortalis vitæ inerant, in mari laborabant. Quia autem Redemtor noster jam corruptionem carnis excesserat, post resurrectionem suam in littore stabat. So too Grotius, the occasional depth and beauty of whose annotations have scarcely obtained the credit which they deserve: Significans se per resurrectionem jam esse in vado, ipsos in salo versari. For Him henceforward there is no more sea (Rev. xxi. 1).

labours proverbially uncertain, at one time bearing no fruit, at another crowned with largest success. '*They answered Him, No.*' The question was indeed asked to draw forth this acknowledgment from their lips: for in small things as in great, in natural as in spiritual, it is well that the confessions of man's poverty should go before the incomings of the riches of God's bounty and grace (cf. John v. 6; vi. 7–9).

'*And He said unto them, Cast the net on the right side of the ship, and ye shall find.*' They take the counsel as of one possibly more skilful in their art than themselves: '*They cast therefore, and now they were not able to draw it for the multitude of fishes*' (Ezek. xlvi. 10). But this is enough; there is one disciple at least, '*that disciple whom Jesus loved,*' who can no longer doubt with whom they have to do. That other occasion, when at the bidding of their future Lord they enclosed so vast a multitude of fishes that their net brake, rises clear before his eyes (Luke v. 1–11). It is the same Lord in whose presence now they stand. And he says, not yet to all, but to Peter, to him with whom he stood in nearest fellowship (John xx. 3; Acts iii. 1), who had best right to be first made partaker of the discovery, '*It is the Lord.*' Each Apostle comes wonderfully out in his proper character:[1] he of the eagle eye first detects the presence of the Beloved; and then Peter, the foremost ever in act, as John is profoundest in speculation, unable to wait till the ship shall touch the land, '*girt his fisher's coat*[2] *unto him,*' this for seemli-

[1] Chrysostom: 'Ὡς δὲ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτὸν, πάλιν τὰ ἰδιώματα τῶν οἰκείων ἐπιδείκνυνται τρόπων οἱ μαθηταὶ Πέτρος καὶ Ἰωάννης· ὁ μὲν γὰρ θερμότερος, ὁ δὲ ὑψηλότερος ἦν· καὶ ὁ μὲν ὀξύτερος ἦν, ὁ δὲ διορατικώτερος. Tristram (*Natural History of the Bible*, p. 285): 'The density of the shoals of fish in the sea of Galilee can scarcely be conceived by those who have not witnessed them.'

[2] Deyling: Ἐπενδύτην ad Christum iturus sibi circumjiciebat, ne minus honestus et modestus in conspectum Domini veniret. Others, as Euthymius and Lampe, suppose this ἐπενδύτης was the only garment which he had on; that even as regarded that, he was ἄζωστος, and so,

ness,[1] '*and cast himself into the sea*,' that he might find himself the sooner at his Saviour's feet (Matt. xiv. 28; John xx. 6).[2] He was before '*naked*,' stripped, that is, for toil, wearing only the tunic, or garment close to the skin, and having put off his upper and superfluous garments;[3] for '*naked*' need mean no more. Some suppose that he walked on the sea; but we have no right to multiply miracles, and the words, '*cast himself into the sea*,' do not warrant, but rather

in a manner, γυμνός: but going to the Lord, he girt it up; whether for comeliness, or that it might not hinder him in swimming. The matter would be clear, if we knew certainly what the ἐπενδύτης was;—plainly no *under* garment or vest, worn close to the skin, ὑποδύτης (see Passow, s. vv.); but rather that worn *over all*, as the robe which Jonathan gives to David is called τὸν ἐπενδύτην τὸν ἐπάνω (1 Sam. xviii. 4, LXX). This is certainly the simplest explanation; that Peter, being stripped before, now hastily threw his upper garment over him, which yet he girt up, that it might not prove an impediment in swimming.

[1] Ambrose: Immemor periculi, non tamen immemor reverentiæ.

[2] The wonderful skill with which the upholders of the pretensions of the See of Rome find proof and prophecy of this or almost every act of St. Peter's life does not fail Pope Innocent III. here. In his famous Epistle to the Constantinopolitan Primate in proof of the Roman supremacy, he thus 'improves' what St. Peter here did: Quod ex eo etiam evidenter apparet, quia cum Dominus apparuisset in littore discipulis navigantibus, sciens Petrus quod Dominus esset, se misit in mare, ac aliis navigio venientibus, ipse sine beneficio navis ad Dominum festinavit. Cum enim mare mundum designet, per hoc quod Petrus se misit in mare, privilegium expressit pontificii singularis, per quod universum orbem susceperat gubernandum, ceteris apostolis ut vehiculo navis contentis, cum nulli eorum universus fuerit orbis commissus, sed singulis singulæ provinciæ vel ecclesiæ potius deputatæ.

[3] Thus Virgil: *Nudus* ara (cf. Matt. xxiv. 18), following Hesiod, who bids the husbandman γυμνὸν σπείρειν, γυμνὸν δὲ βοωτεῖν (*Opera*, 389). Cincinnatus was found 'naked' at the plough, when called to be Dictator, and sent for his toga that he might appear before the Senate (Pliny, *H. N.* xviii. 4); and Plutarch says of Phocion, that, in the country and with the army, he went always unshod and 'naked' (ἀνυπόδητος ἀεὶ καὶ γυμνὸς ἐβάδιζεν): while Grotius quotes from Eusebius a yet apter passage, in which one says, ἦμην γυμνὸς ἐν τῷ λινῷ ἐσθήματι. The Athenian jest that the Spartans showed to foreigners their virgins 'naked' must be taken in the same sense,—with only the chiton or himation (μονοχίτωνες, Müller, *Dorians*, iv. 2, 3); cf. 1 Sam. xix. 24; Isai. xx. 2; at which last passage Tindal scoffs, as though God had commanded an indecency (see Deyling, *Obss. Sac.* vol. iv. p. 888, seq., the *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Antt.* s. v. Nudus; and Tristram, *Natural History of the Bible*, p. 290).

forbid, this. Rather, he swam and waded to the shore,[1] which was not distant more than about '*two hundred cubits*,'[2] that is, about one hundred yards. The other disciples followed more slowly; for they were encumbered with the net and its weight of fishes. This, having renounced the hope of lifting it into the boat, they dragged[3] after them in the water, toward the land. '*As soon then as they were come to land, they saw a fire of coals there, and fish laid thereon, and bread*'—by what ministry, natural or miraculous, has been often inquired; but we must leave this undetermined as we find it. The adjuncts of the scene and the whole tone of the narration certainly suggest the latter. '*Jesus saith unto them, Bring of the fish which ye have now caught.*' These shall be added to those already preparing.[4] Peter, again the foremost, '*went up and drew the net to land full of great fishes, an hundred and fifty and three;*' while yet, setting a notable difference between this and a similar event of an earlier day (Luke v. 6), '*for all there were so many, yet was not the net broken.*'

It is hard to believe that all this should have happened, or should have been recorded with this emphasis and minuteness of detail, had it no other meaning than that which is ostensible and on the surface. There must be more here than meets the eye—an allegorical, or more

[1] Ambrose: Periculoso compendio religiosum maturavit obsequium.

[2] Ovid's advice to the fisher is to keep this moderate distance:

> Nec tamen in medias pelagi te pergere sedes
> Admoneam, vastique maris tentare profundum.
> Inter utrumque loci melius moderabere finem, &c.

[3] Observe St. John's accurate distinction in the use of *σύρειν* here, and *ἑλκύειν* at ver. 6, 11; this last being to *draw to* you (ziehen, De Wette); that, to *drag after* you (nachschleppen): see my *Synonyms of the New Testament*, § 21.

[4] To the abundance and excellency of the fish in this lake many bear testimony. Thus Robinson (*Biblical Researches*, vol. ii. p. 261): 'The lake is full of fishes of various kinds,' and he instances sturgeon, chub and bream; adding, 'we had no difficulty in procuring an abundant supply for our evening and morning meal; and found them delicate and well-flavoured.'

truly a symbolic, meaning underlying the literal. Nor is this very hard to discover. Without pledging oneself for every detail of Augustine's interpretation,[1] it yet commends itself as in the main worthy of acceptance. He puts this miraculous draught of fishes in relations of likeness and unlikeness with the other before the Resurrection (Luke v. 1–11), and sees in that earlier, the figure of the Church as it now is, and as it now gathers its members from the world; in this later the figure of the Church as it shall be in the end of the world, with the large incoming and sea-harvest of souls, 'the fulness of the Gentiles' which then shall find place.[2] On that prior occasion the 'fishers of men' that should be, were not particularly bidden to cast the net on the right hand or on the left; for, had Christ said to the right, it would have implied that none should be taken but the good,—if to the left,

[1] Augustine (*Serm.* ccxlviii. 1): Nunquam hoc Dominus juberet, nisi aliquid significare vellet, quod nobis nôsse expediret. Quid ergo pro magno potuit ad Jesum Christum pertinere, si pisces caperentur aut si non caperentur? Sed illa piscatio, nostra erat significatio.

[2] Augustine (*In Ev. Joh. tract.* cxxii.): Sicut hoc loco qualiter in seculi fine futura sit [Ecclesia], ita Dominus aliâ piscatione significavit Ecclesiam qualiter nunc sit. Quod autem illud fecit in initio prædicationis suæ, hoc vero post resurrectionem suam, hinc ostendit illam capturam piscium, bonos et malos significare, quos nunc habet Ecclesia; istam vero tantummodo bonos quos habebit in æternum, completâ in fine hujus seculi resurrectione mortuorum. Denique ibi Jesus, non sicut hîc in littore stabat, quando jussit pisces capi, sed ascendens in unam navim . . . dixit ad Simonem, Duc in altum, et laxate retia vestra in capturam. . . . Ibi retia non mittuntur in dexteram, ne solos significent bonos, nec in sinistram, ne solos malos; sed indifferenter, Laxate, inquit, retia vestra in capturam, ut permixtos intelligamus bonos et malos: hîc autem inquit, Mittite in dexteram navigii rete, ut significaret eos qui stabant ad dexteram, solos bonos. Ibi rete propter significanda schismata rumpebatur; hîc vero, quoniam tunc jam in illâ summâ pace sanctorum nulla erunt schismata, pertinuit ad Evangelistam dicere, Et cum tanti essent, id est, tam magni, non est scissum rete; tanquam illud respiceret ubi scissum est, et in illius mali comparatione commendaret hoc bonum. Cf. *Serm.* ccxlviii.–cclii.; *Brev. Coll. con. Donat.* 3; *Quæst.* 83, qu. 8; and Gregory the Great (*Hom. in Evang.* 24), who, following the exposition of Augustine, yet makes far more of Peter's part, especially of his bringing of the net to land, all which may easily be accounted for, the idea of the Papacy having in his time developed itself much further.

that only the bad; while yet, so long as the present confusions endure, both bad and good are enclosed in the nets; but now He says, '*Cast the net on the right side of the ship*,' implying that all which are taken should be good; and this, because the *right* is ever the hand of good omen and of value. Thus the sheep are placed at the *right* hand (Matt. xxv. 33); the *right* eye, if need be, shall be plucked out, the *right* hand cut off (Matt. v. 29, 30); the *right* eye of the idol shepherd, the eye of spiritual understanding, shall be utterly darkened (Zech. xi. 17). Ezekiel lies on his left side for Israel, but on his *right* for Judah (Ezek. iv. 4, 6); which, with all its sins, has not yet been rejected (cf. Hos. xi. 12; Gen. xlviii. 17; 1 Kin. ii. 19; Acts vii. 55). No painter ever thinks of putting the *penitent* thief on other than the right hand of the Lord. On that former occasion the nets were broken with the multitude of fishes, so that all were not secured which for a time were within them; and what are the schisms and divisions of the present condition of the Church, but rents and holes through which numbers, that impatiently bear the restraints of the net, break away from it?—but now, in the end of time, '*for all there were so many, yet was not the net broken*.'[1] On that first occasion the fishes were brought into the ship, itself still tossed on the unquiet sea, even as men in the present time who are taken for Christ are brought into the Church, itself not in haven yet; but here the nets are drawn up to land, to the safe and quiet shore of eternity.[2] Then the ships were wellnigh sunken with their burden, for so is it with the ship of the Church,—encumbered with evil-livers till

[1] Οὐκ ἐσχίσθη. Already in the apostolic times σχίσμα was the technical term for a spiritual rent or tear in the Church; thus see 1 Cor. i. 10; xi. 18; xii. 25.

[2] Augustine (*Serm.* ccli. 3): In illâ piscatione non ad littus adtracta sunt retia: sed ipsi pisces qui capti sunt, in naviculas fusi sunt. Hic autem traxerunt ad littus. Spera finem seculi. Cf. Gregory the Great, *Hom.* xxiv. *in Evang.*

it wellnigh makes shipwreck altogether; but no danger of this kind threatens here.[1] Then a great but indefinite multitude was enclosed; but here a definite number, even as the number of the elect is fixed and pre-ordained;[2] and there small fishes and great, for nothing to the contrary is said; but here they are all '*great*,' for all shall be such who attain to that kingdom, being equal to the Angels.[3]

'*Jesus saith unto them, Come and dine. And none of the disciples durst ask Him, Who art Thou? knowing that it was the Lord.*' But if they knew, why should they desire to ask? I take the Evangelist to imply that they would gladly have obtained from his own lips an avowal that it was Himself and no other; yet they did not venture to put the question—it seemed to them so much too bold and familiar—which would have drawn this avowal from Him. They knew '*that it was the Lord*;' yet would they willingly have had this assurance sealed and made still more certain to them by his own word, which for all this

[1] Augustine (*Serm.* ccxlix.): Implentur navigia duo propter populos duos de circumcisione et præputio: et sic implentur, ut premantur, et pene mergantur. Hoc quod significat gemendum est. Turba turbavit Ecclesiam. Quam magnum numerum fecerunt male viventes, prementes et *gementes* [pene mergentes?]. Sed propter pisces bonos non sunt mersa navigia.

[2] Augustine and others enter into laborious calculations to show why the fishes were exactly one hundred and fifty-three, and the mystery of this number; while Hengstenberg believes that the key to the explanation is to be found at 2 Chron. ii. 17. But the significance is not in that particular number, which seems chosen to exclude this, herein unlike the hundred and forty-four thousand (12 × 12) of the Apocalypse (vii. 4); but in its being a fixed and definite number at all: just as in Ezekiel's temple (ch. xl. seq.) each measurement is not, and cannot be made, significant; but that all is by measurement is most significant; for thus we are taught that in the rearing of the spiritual temple no caprice or wilfulness of men may find room, but that all is laid down according to a pre-ordained purpose and will of God. To number, as to measure and to weigh, is a Divine attribute: cf. Job xxviii. 25; xxxviii. 5; Isai. xl. 12; and the noble debate in St. Augustine (*De Lib. Arbit.* ii. 11–16) on all the works of wisdom being by number.

[3] Augustine (*Serm.* ccxlviii. 3): Quis est enim ibi tunc parvus, quando erunt æquales Angelis Dei?

they shrank from seeking to obtain, so majestic and awe-inspiring was his presence now[1] (cf. iv. 27; Judg. xiii. 6).

'*Jesus then cometh, and taketh bread, and giveth them, and fish likewise.*' What follows is obscure, and without the key which the symbolical explanation supplies, would be obscurer yet. What is the meaning of this meal which they found ready prepared for them on the shore, and which the Lord with his own hands distributed to them? For Himself, with his risen body, it was superfluous, nor does He seem to have shared, but only to have dealt to them, the food; as little was it needed by them, whose homes were near at hand; while indeed a single loaf or flat cake, and a single fish, for this is implied in the original, though not in our Version, would have proved a scanty meal for the seven. But we must continue to see an under-meaning, and a rich and deep one, in all this. As that large take of fish was to them the pledge and promise of a labour that should not be in vain,[2] so the meal when the labour was done, a meal of the Lord's own preparing and dispensing, and '*upon the shore*,' was the symbol of the great festival in heaven with which, after their earthly toil was over, He would refresh his servants, when He should cause them to sit down with Abraham

[1] Augustine does not seem to me to have *quite* hit it (*In Ev. Joh. tract.* cxxiii.): Si ergo sciebant, quid opus erat ut interrogarent? Si autem non opus erat, quare dictum est, non audebant: quasi opus esset, sed timore aliquo non auderent? Sensus ergo hic est: Tanta erat evidentia veritatis, quâ Jesus illis discipulis apparebat, ut eorum non solum negare, sed nec dubitare quidem ullus auderet: quoniam si quisquam dubitaret, utique interrogare deberet. Sic ergo dictum est, Nemo audebat eum interrogare, Tu quis es? ac si diceretur, Nemo audebat dubitare quod ipse esset. Cf. Chrysostom, *In Joh. Hom.* lxxxvii.

[2] Maldonatus: Missurus erat paulo post Christus discipulos suos in omnem terrarum orbem, quasi in altum ac latum mare, ut homines piscarentur. Poterant inscitiam, poterant imbecillitatem suam excusare, se homines esse litterarum rudes, id est, piscandi imperitos, paucos præterea et infirmos, quî posse se tot tamque grandes pisces capere, tot oratores, tot tantosque philosophos irretire et a sententiâ dimovere? Voluit ergo Christus exemplo artis propriæ docere id ipsos suis viribus suâque industriâ facere nullo modo posse, idque significat quod totam laborantes noctem nihil ceperant; ipsius vero ope atque auxilio facillime facturos.

and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom (Matt. xxii. 1; xxv. 20; Luke xii. 37; xxii. 30; Rev. vii. 17; xix. 9). The meal was sacramental in character, and had nothing to do with the stilling of their present hunger.[1]

The most interesting conversation which follows hangs too closely upon this miracle to be passed over. Christ has given to his servants a prophetic glimpse of their work and their reward; and He now declares to them the sole conditions under which this work may be accomplished, and this reward obtained. Love to Him, the unreserved yielding up of self to God—these are the sole conditions, and all which follows is to teach this: thus the two portions of the chapter constitute together a perfect whole. '*So when they had dined, Jesus saith to Simon Peter, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me more than these?*'[2] In that compellation, '*Simon, son of Jonas*,' there was already that which must have wrung the Apostle's heart. It was as though his Lord would say to him, 'Where is that name Peter, which I gave thee (Matt. xvi. 18; John i. 42)? where is the Rock, and the rock-like strength, which, when most needed, I looked for in vain (Matt. xxvi. 69–75)? Not therefore by that name can I address thee now, but as flesh and blood, and the child of man; for all that once was higher in thee has disappeared.'[3] In the

[1] Augustine (*In Ev. Joh. tract.* cxxiii.): Piscis assus, Christus est passus. Ipse est et panis qui de cælo descendit. Hinc incorporatur Ecclesia ad participandam beatitudinem sempiternam. Ammonius: Τὸ, Δεῦτε ἀριστήσατε, αἴνιγμα ἔχει ὁ λόγος, ὅτι μετὰ τοὺς πόνους διαδέξεται τοὺς ἁγίους ἀνάπαυσις καὶ τρυφὴ καὶ ἀπόλαυσις. Gregory the Great (*Hom.* xxiv. *in Evang.*) notes how the number who here feast with the Lord are seven, the number of perfection and completion.

[2] Πλεῖον τούτων. This *might* mean, and Whitby affirms that it does mean,—'more than thou lovest *these things*, thy nets and thy boat and other worldly gear.' But the words, so understood, yield a sense so trivial and unworthy, as to render it impossible that this can be the Lord's meaning. For another very strange perversion of these words on the part of the Brethren of the Free Spirit, medieval pantheists, see Hahn, *Gesch. d. Ketzer im Mittelalter*, vol. ii. p. 482.

[3] We read in *The Modern Syrians*, p. 304, of one of the Caliphs that 'he used to give his principal officers an honourable surname suited to

question itself lies a plain allusion to Peter's vainglorious word, not recorded by this Evangelist, 'Though all men shall be offended because of Thee, yet will I never be offended' (Matt. xxvi. 33). Hengstenberg indeed in his self-confident way denies, but in the face of all expositors of all times, that there is here any reference to that former boast of his. Peter understood his Lord better, and no longer casting any slight by comparison on the love of his fellow-disciples, is satisfied with affirming his own,[1] appealing at the same time to the Lord, the searcher of all hearts, whether, despite of all that miserable backsliding in the palace of the High Priest, this love of his was not fervent and sincere. '*He saith unto Him, Yea, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee.*' The Lord's rejoinder, '*Feed my sheep*,' '*Feed my lambs*,' is not so much, 'Show then thy love in act,' as rather, 'I restore to thee thy apostolic function; this grace is thine, that thou shalt yet be a chief shepherd of my flock.'[2] It implies, therefore, the fullest forgiveness of the past, since none but the forgiven could rightly declare the forgiveness of God. The question, '*Lovest thou Me?*'[3] is thrice repeated, that by

their qualities. When he wished to show his dissatisfaction, he used to drop it, calling them by their own names; this caused them great alarm. When he resumed the employment of the surname, it was a sign of their return to favour.'

[1] Augustine (*Serm.* cxlvii. 2): Non potuit dicere nisi, Amo te: non ausus est dicere, plus his. Noluit iterum esse mendax. Sufficerat ei testimonium perhibere cordi suo: non debuit esse judex cordis alieni.

[2] In the other way the words are more commonly understood; thus by Augustine a hundred times, as *Serm.* cxlvi. 1: Tamquam et diceret, Amas me? In hoc ostende quia amas me, Pasce oves meas. But Cyril, Chrysostom, Euthymius, are with me. Thus, too, Calvin: Nunc illi tam libertas docendi quam auctoritas restituitur, quarum utramque amiserat suâ culpâ.

[3] When the Lord first puts the question to Peter, it is ἀγαπᾷς με; Peter changes the word, and replies, φιλῶ σε (ver. 15); a second time ἀγαπᾷς appears in the Lord's question, and φιλῶ in Peter's reply (ver. 16); till on the third occasion Jesus, leaving ἀγαπᾷς, asks the question in Peter's own word, φιλεῖς με; on which Peter for the third time replies, φιλῶ σε (ver. 17). There is nothing accidental here, as is plain from the relation in which ἀγαπᾶν and φιλεῖν stand to one another. They differ

three solemn affirmations he may efface his three several denials of his Lord[1] (John xviii. 17; xxv. 27). At last, upon the third repetition of the question, '*Peter was grieved*;' and with yet more emphasis than before appeals to the omniscience of his Lord, whether it was not true that indeed he loved Him: '*Lord, Thou knowest all things*;'—confessing this, he confesses to his Godhead, for of no other but God could this knowledge of the hearts of all men be predicated (Ps. vii. 9; cxxxix.; Ezek. xi. 5;

very nearly as *diligere* and *amare* in Latin (see Döderlein, *Lat. Synon.* vol. iv. p. 89, sqq.; and my *Synonyms of the N. T.* § 12); the Vulgate marking by help of these Latin equivalents the alternation of the words. Ἀγαπᾶν (=diligere=deligere) has more of judgment and deliberate choice; φιλεῖν (=amare) of attachment and special personal affection. Thus ἀγαπᾷς on the lips of the Lord seems to Peter too cold a word; as though his Lord were keeping him at a distance; or at least not inviting him to draw as near as in the passionate yearning of his heart he desired now to do. Therefore, putting this by, he substitutes φιλῶ in its room. A second time he does the same. And now he has conquered; for when the Lord demands a third time whether he loves Him, He employs the word which alone will satisfy Peter, which alone expresses that personal affection with which his heart is full. Ambrose, though not expressing himself very happily, has a right insight into the matter (*Exp. in Luc.* x. 176): Illud quod diligentius intuendum, cur cum Dominus dixerit, *Diligis* me? ille responderit: Tu scis, Domine, quia *amo* te. In quo videtur mihi *dilectio* habere animi caritatem, *amor* quendam æstum conceptum corporis ac mentis ardore, et Petrum opinor non solum animi, sed etiam corporis sui signare flagrantiam.

[1] Augustine (*In Ev. Joh. tract.* cxxiii.): Redditur negationi trinæ trina confessio; ne minus amori lingua serviat quam timori: et plus vocis elicuisse videatur mors imminens, quam vita præsens. *Enarr. in Ps.* xxxvii. 13: Donec trinâ voce amoris solveret trinam vocem negationis. *Serm.* cclxxxv.: Odit Deus præsumtores de viribus suis; et tumorem istum in eis, quos diligit, tamquam medicus secat. Secando quidem infert dolorem; sed firmat postea sanitatem. Itaque resurgens Dominus commendat Petro oves suas illi negatori; sed negatori quia præsumtori, postea pastori quia amatori. Nam quare ter interrogat amantem, nisi ut compungat ter negantem? *Serm.* ccxcv. 4: Ter vincat in amore confessio, quia ter victa est in timore præsumtio. Cf. *Enarr.* ii. *in Ps.* xc. 12. So Cyril, Chrysostom, Epiphanius, Apollinaris, and Ammonius: Διὰ τριῶν τῶν ἐρωτήσεων καὶ καταθέσεων ἐξαλείφει τὰς τρεῖς φωνὰς τῆς ἀρνήσεως, καὶ διὰ λόγων ἐπανορθοῖ τὰ ἐν λόγοις γενόμενα πταίσματα. Not otherwise the Church hymn:

Ter confessus ter negatum,
Gregem pascis ter donatum,
Vitâ, verbo, precibus.

Jer. xvii. 10; 1 Kin. viii. 39; John ii. 24, 25; xvi. 30; Acts i. 24); and from this point of view the title '*Lord*,' which he ascribes to his Master, assumes a new significance;—'*Thou knowest that I love Thee.*'[1]

Many have refused to see any distinction between the two commissions, '*Feed my sheep*,' and '*Feed my lambs.*'[2] To me nothing seems more natural than that by '*lambs*' the Lord intended the more imperfect Christians, the 'little children' in Him (Isai. xl. 11); by the '*sheep*' the more advanced, the 'young men' and 'fathers'[3] (1 John ii. 12–14). The interpretation indeed is groundless and trifling, made in the interests of Rome, which sees in the '*lambs*' the laity, and in the '*sheep*' the clergy; and that here to Peter, and in him to the Roman pontiffs, was given dominion over both. The commission should at

[1] Augustine (*Serm.* cclii. 1): Contristatus est Petrus. Quid contristaris, Petre, quia ter respondes amorem? Oblitus es trinum timorem? Sine interroget te Dominus: medicus est qui te interrogat, ad sanitatem pertinet, quod interrogat. Noli tædio affici. Expecta, impleatur numerus dilectionis, ut deleat numerum negationis.

[2] The received text makes the order in Christ's threefold commission to Peter, to be as follows: *ἀρνία* (ver. 15), *πρόβατα* (ver. 16), and again *πρόβατα* (ver. 17). Tischendorf, on the authority of A C, for the last *πρόβατα*, reads *προβάτια*, which word, never else occurring in the New Testament, nor yet in the Septuagint, would scarcely have found its way without just cause into the text. At the same time *ἀρνία*, *πρόβατα*, *προβάτια*, fail altogether in this order to make a climax; and one is tempted to suspect that *προβάτια* and *πρόβατα* should change places; all then would follow excellently well. Remarkably confirming this conjecture, first made, I believe, by Bellarmine, St. Ambrose (*Exp. in Luc.* x. 176), expounding this text, uses his Latin equivalents exactly in this order; first agnos (=*ἀρνία*), then oviculas (=*προβάτια*), and lastly oves (=*πρόβατα*): nor is this an accident, but he makes a point of this ascending scale, saying on that third injunction, 'Feed *my sheep*:' Et jam non agnos, nec oviculas, sed oves pascere jubetur. We further note that the Vulgate has not one agnos and two oves, which would correspond to our received reading, but two agnos and one oves, which is much nearer that which is conjectured. In the Peschito, justly celebrated for its verbal accuracy, there is a difference exactly answering to Ambrose's agnos, oviculas, and oves.

[3] Wetstein: Oves istæ quo tempore Petro committebantur, erant adhuc teneri agni, novitii discipuli a Petro ex Judæis et gentibus adducendi. Quando vero etiam oves committit, significat eum ad senectutem victurum, et ecclesiam constitutam et ordinatam visurum esse.

least have run, '*Feed my sheep*,' '*Feed my shepherds*,' if any such conclusions were to be drawn from it, though many and huge links in the chain of proofs would be wanting still.[1]

But '*Feed my sheep*' is not all. This life of labour is to be crowned with a death of painfulness; such is the way, with its narrow and strait gate, which even for a chief Apostle is the only one which leads to eternal life. The Lord will show him beforehand what great things he must suffer for his sake; as is often his manner with his elect servants, with an Ezekiel (iii. 25), with a Paul (Acts xxi. 11), and now with a Peter. '*Verily, verily, I say unto thee, when thou wast young, thou girdedst thyself*'—it is impossible to miss an allusion here to the promptitude with which Peter had just girt himself that he might the sooner join his Lord—'*and walkedst whither thou wouldest; but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldest not.*'[2] A prophetic allusion is here made to the crucifixion of Peter, St. John himself declaring that Jesus spake thus, '*signifying by what death he should glorify God*' (cf. John xii. 33; and 1 Pet. iv. 16, in which last passage we cannot fail to recognize a reminiscence of these words); and no reasonable grounds exist for calling in question the tradition of the Church, that such was the manner of Peter's martyrdom.[3] Doubtless it is here *obscurely* intimated;[4] but this in the very nature of prophecy, and there is quite enough in the description to show that the Lord had this and no

[1] See Bernard, *De Consid.* ii. 8.

[2] Instead of the words ἄλλος ζώσει σε, κ. τ. λ., the Codex Sinaiticus has this remarkable variation, ἄλλοι ζώσουσίν σε, καὶ ποιήσουσίν σοι ὅσα οὐ θέλεις.

[3] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 25; iii. 1.

[4] Bleek (*Beiträge zur Evang. Kritik*, p. 237) thinks the adaptation of these words to the death by crucifixion altogether forced and artificial, and proposes quite another interpretation of them; but one which will scarcely commend itself even to those who find the commonly received not wholly satisfactory.

other manner of death in his eye. The stretched-forth hands are the hands extended on the transverse bar of the cross.[1] The girding by another is the binding to the cross, the sufferer being not only fastened to the instrument of punishment with nails, but also bound to it with cords.[2] It cannot be meant by the bearing '*whither thou wouldest not*,' that there should be any reluctancy on the part of Peter to glorify God by his death, except indeed the reluctancy which there always is in the flesh to suffering and pain (Ephes. v. 29) ; a reluctancy in his case, as in his Lord's (cf. Matt. xxvi. 39), overruled by the higher willingness to do and to suffer the perfect will of God. In this sense, as it was a violent death,—a death which others chose for him,—a death from which flesh and blood would naturally shrink, it was a carrying '*whither he would not*;'[3] though, in a higher sense, as it was the way to a nearer

[1] Theophylact: Τὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ ἔκτασιν καὶ τὰ δεσμὰ δηλοῖ. The passages most to the point as showing that this would be an image which one who, without naming, yet wished to indicate, crucifixion, would use, are these: Seneca (*Consol. ad Marciam*, 20): Video istic cruces non unius quidem generis; . . . alii brachia patibulo explicuerunt; Tertullian (*De Pudic.* 22): In patibulo jam corpore expanso; and again, with allusion to the stretching out of the hands in prayer; Paratus est ad omne supplicium ipse habitus orantis Christiani: Arrian (*Epictetus*, iii. 26): Ἐκτείνας σεαυτὸν, ὡς οἱ ἐσταυρωμένοι. The passage adduced from Plautus,

> Credo ego tibi esse eundum extra portam,
> Dispessis manibus patibulum quum habebis,

is not quite satisfying; being probably an allusion to the marching of the criminal along, with his arms attached to the *fork* upon his neck, before he is himself fastened to the cross (see Becker, *Gallus*, vol. i. p. 131; and Wetstein, in loc.).

[2] So Tertullian (*Scorp.* 15): Tunc Petrus ab altero cingitur, cum cruci astringitur; or it may be, as Lücke suggests, the girding the sufferer round the middle, who otherwise would be wholly naked on the cross; he quotes from the *Evang. Nicod.* 10: Ἐξέδυσαν οἱ στρατιῶται τὸν Ἰησοῦν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, καὶ περιέζωσαν αὐτὸν λεντίῳ.

[3] Chrysostom (*In Joh. Hom.* 88): Ὅπου οὐ θέλεις· τῆς φύσεως λέγει τὸ συμπαθὲς καὶ τῆς σαρκὸς τὴν ἀνάγκην, καὶ ὅτι ἄκουσα ἀποῤῥήγνυται τοῦ σώματος ἡ ψυχή. Cf. Augustine's beautiful words, *Serm.* ccxcix., and *Serm.* clxxiii. 2: Quis enim vult mori? Prorsus nemo: et ita nemo ut beato Petro diceretur, Alter te cinget, et feret quo tu non vis.

vision of God, it was that toward which he had all his life been striving; and he then was borne whither most he would; no word here implying that the exulting exclamation of another Apostle, at the near approach of his martyrdom (2 Tim. iv. 6–8; cf. Phil. i. 21, 23), would not have suited his lips just as well.[1] It is to this prophetic intimation of his death that St. Peter probably alludes in his second Epistle (i. 14).[2]

The symbolical meaning which we have found in the earlier portions of the chapter must not be excluded from this. To 'gird oneself' is ever in Scripture the sign and figure of promptness for an outward activity (Exod. xii. 11; 1 Kin. xviii. 46; 2 Kin. iv. 29; Jer. i. 17; Luke xii. 35; xvii. 8; Acts xii. 8; 1 Pet. i. 13; Ephes. vi. 14); so that, in fact, Christ is saying to Peter, 'When thou wast young, thou *actedst* for Me; going whither thou wouldest, thou wast free to work for Me, and to choose thy field of work. But when thou art old, thou shalt learn another, a higher and a harder lesson; thou shalt *suffer* for Me; thou shalt no more choose thy work, but others shall choose it for thee, and that work shall be the work of passion rather than of action.' Such is the history of the Christian life, and not in Peter's case only, but the course and order of it in almost all of God's servants. It is begun in action, it is perfected in suffering. In the last, lessons are learned which the first could never have taught; graces called out, which else would not at all, or would only have very weakly, existed. Thus was it, for instance, with a John Baptist. He begins with Jerusalem and all Judæa flowing to him to listen to his preaching; he ends with lying long, seemingly a forgotten captive, in the dungeon of Machærus. So fared it with a St. Chrysostom. The chief cities of

[1] Guilliaud: Carni mors nunquam adlubescit, et nolle mori carni cognatum est. Hoc nolle Christus in humeros suos transtulit ut vinceret. Quare ut Christus hoc nolle in se vicit (ut in carne nostrâ maneat aliquod vestigium), ita per fidem victoria in nos transfertur.

[2] Possibly also Clement of Rome, *Ep.* § 5.

Asia and Europe, Antioch and Constantinople, wait upon him with reverence and homage while he is young, and he goes whither he would; but when he is old, he is borne up and down, whither he would not, a sick and suffering exile. Thus should it be also with this great Apostle (John xxi. 18). It was only in this manner that whatever of self-will and self-choosing survived in him still, should be broken and abolished, that he should be brought into an entire emptiness of self, a perfect submission to the will of God.[1]

He who has shown him the end, will also show him the way; for '*when He had spoken this, He saith unto him, Follow Me.*'[2] These words signify much more than in a general way, 'Be thou an imitator of Me.' The scene at this time enacted on the shores of Gennesaret, was quite as much in deed as in word; and here, at the very moment

[1] In this view the passage was a very favourite one with the mystic writers. Thus Tauler (*Homil.* p. 176): Sic et nobiscum agit Dominus Deus noster. In conversionis nostræ primordiis amoris sui igne suavissimo nos inflammabat, dulcedinem suam crebro nos sentire faciebat, adeoque muneribus gratiæ suæ nostram trahebat voluntatem, ut quicquid volebat ipse optatissimum erat voluntati nostræ. At nunc aliter se res habet; aliâ nunc nobis viâ gradiendum est. Vult namque Deus ut propriam voluntatem nostram et nosipsos, licet ipsa voluntas renitatur plurimum, penitus abnegemus, et ipsum Dominum Deum nostrum in his quæ dura nobis et adversa sinit occurrere, et in eâ quam nobis exhibet austeritate atque rigore, in omni denique eventu etiam contra voluntatem sensualitatis nostræ, sponte ac toto affectu suscipiamus. Hoc est quod idem ipse olim suo discipulo et Apostolorum principi ait. Cum esses, inquit, junior, cingebas te, et ambulabas quo volebas. Cum autem senueris, alius te cinget, et ducet quo tu non vis. . . . Vult, inquam, ut velle et nolle cesset in nobis, ut sive det, sive auferat, sive abundemus, sive penuriam sentiamus, perinde sit nobis; ut demum abdicantes omnia et oblivioni tradentes, ipsum solum in gratis et odiosis nude capiamus, utque ceteris quibusque neglectis, ipsi uni inhæreamus.

[2] I noted a few pages back (p. 498) the ingenuity with which Pope Innocent III., in his letter on the Roman Supremacy, turned to account almost every event in the life of St. Peter. He is equal to the present occasion: Tu me sequere: quod utique non tam de sequelâ perferendæ passionis quam creditæ dispensationis debet intelligi, cum et Andreas et quidam alii præter Petrum sicut Dominus fuerint crucifixi, sed solum Petrum sustinuit sibi Dominus et in officio vicarium, et in magisterio successorem.

that the Lord spake the words, it would seem that He took some paces along the rough and rocky shore, bidding Peter to follow; thus setting forth to him in a figure his future life, which should be a following of his divine Master in the rude and rugged path of Christian action.[1] All this was not so much spoken as done; for Peter, '*turning about*,'—looking, that is, behind him,—'*seeth the disciple whom Jesus loved*'—words not introduced idly, and as little so the allusion to his familiarity at the Paschal supper, but to explain the boldness of John in following unbidden;[2] him he sees '*following*,' and thereupon inquires, '*Lord, and what shall this man do?*' He would know what his portion shall be, and what the issue of his earthly conversation. Shall he, too, follow by the same rugged path? It is not very easy to determine the motive of this question, or the spirit in which it was asked: it was certainly something more than a mere natural curiosity. Augustine takes it as the question of one concerned that his friend should be left out, and not summoned to the honour of the same close following of his Lord with himself; who would fain that as in life, so in death they should not be divided (2 Sam. i. 23).[3] Others find a motive less noble in it; that it was put more in the

[1] Grotius here says excellently well: Sicut modo res ante gestas signa dicendorum sumsit, ita nunc quod dixerat signo conspicuo exprimit. Nam Sequere me, sensum habet et illum communem cui etiam Petrus in præsens paruit, et mysticum alterum. Alludit ad id quod dixerat Matt. x. 38.

[2] Bengel: Ut autem in cœnâ illâ ita nunc quoque locum quærebat, et se familiariter insinuabat, propemodum magis, quam Petrus libenter perferret.

[3] *Serm* ccliii. 3: Quomodo ego sequor, et ipse non sequitur? Jerome's (*Adv. Jovin.* i. 26) is slightly different: Nolens deserere Johannem, cum quo semper fuerat copulatus. In later times many have seen in Peter's words the jealousy of the practical life for the contemplative. The first thinks hardly of the other, counts it a shunning of the cross, a shrinking from earnest labour in the Lord's cause,—would fain have it also to be a martyr not merely in will, but in deed; see on this matter the very interesting extracts from the writings of the Abbot Joachim, in Neander, *Kirch. Gesch.* vol. v. p. 440.

temper of Martha, when she asked the Lord, 'Lord, dost Thou not care that my sister hath left me to serve alone' (Luke x. 40)? ill satisfied that Mary should remain quietly sitting at Jesus' feet, while she was engaged in laborious service for Him.[1] It is certainly possible that Peter, knowing all which that '*Follow Me*,' addressed to himself, implied, may have felt a moment's jealousy at the easier lot assigned to John.

But let it have been this jealousy, or that anxiety concerning the way in which the Lord would lead his fellow Apostle (and oftentimes it is harder to commit those whom we love to his guiding than ourselves, and to dismiss in regard of them all distrustful fears), it is plain that the source out of which the question proceeded was not altogether a pure one. There lies something of a check in the reply. These 'times and seasons' it is not for him to know, nor to intermeddle with things which are the Lord's alone. *He* claims to be the allotter of the several portions

[1] Partly no doubt their general character, as unfolded in the Gospels, but mainly this passage, has caused the two Apostles, St. Peter and St. John, to be accepted in the Church as the types, one of Christian action, the other of Christian contemplation; one, like the servants, *working* for its absent Lord; the other, like the virgins, *waiting* for Him: the office of the first, the active labouring for Christ, to cease and pass away, when the need of this should have passed; but of the other to remain (μένειν) till the coming of the Lord, and not then to cease, but to continue for evermore. Thus Augustine in a noble passage, of which this is but a fragment (*In Ev. Joh. tract.* cxxiv.): Duas itaque vitas sibi divinitus prædicatas et commendatas novit Ecclesia, quarum est una in fide, altera in specie; una in tempore peregrinationis, altera in æternitate mansionis; una in labore, altera in requie; una in viâ, altera in patriâ; una in opere actionis, altera in mercede contemplationis; . . . . una bona et mala discernit, altera quæ sola bona sunt, cernit: ergo una bona est, sed adhuc misera, altera melior et beata. Ista significata est per Apostolum Petrum, illa per Johannem. Tota hîc agitur ista usque in hujus seculi finem, et illic invenit finem: differtur illa complenda post hujus seculi finem, sed in futuro seculo non habet finem. Ideo dicitur huic, Sequere me: de illo autem, Sic eum volo manere donec veniam quid ad te? Tu me sequere. . . . . Quod apertius ita dici potest, Perfecta me sequatur actio, informata meæ passionis exemplo; inchoata vero contemplatio maneat donec venio, perficienda cum venero. All this reappears in the twelfth century in connexion with the *Evangelium Æternum* (see Neander, as in the last note).

of his servants, and gives account of none of his matters: '*If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? follow thou Me*' (cf. John ii. 4). At the same time this, like so many of our Lord's repulses, is not a mere repulse. He may refuse to comply with an untimely request, yet seldom or never by a blank negation; and often He gives even in the very act of seeming to deny; his Nay proving indeed a veiled Yea. So it was here. For assuredly the error of those brethren who drew from these words the conclusion, '*that that disciple should not die*,' had not its root in the mistaking a mere hypothetical '*If I will*,' for a distinct prophetical announcement. That '*If I will*' is no hypothetical case. As Christ did not mean, so certainly the disciples did not take Him to mean, 'If I choose that the laws of natural decay and death should be suspended in his case, and that thus he should live on till my return to judgment, this is nothing to thee.' Rather, even while He checks Peter for asking the question, He does declare his pleasure that John should '*tarry*' till his coming. Nor may we empty this '*tarry*' of all deeper significance, which many, willing to make all things easy here, but who only succeed in making them easy by making them trivial, have done—as though it meant, '*tarry*' in Galilee, or '*tarry*' in Jerusalem, while Peter was laboriously preaching the Gospel over all the world. To '*tarry*' can be taken in no other sense than that of to remain alive (cf. Phil. i. 25; 1 Cor. xv. 6; John xii. 34).

But how could Christ thus announce that John should '*tarry*' till He came? Two answers have been given. Augustine, whom Grotius, Lampe,[1] and many moderns follow, understands '*till I come*' to signify, 'till I take him away—till I summon him by an easy and natural death to Myself.' But where then is the antithesis be-

[1] Si nolo eum morte violentâ tolli quasi ante diem, sed manere in placidâ senectute superstitem usque dum veniam et morte naturali illum ad me recipiam, quid istud ad te?

tween his lot and Peter's? However violent and painful the death of Peter may have been, yet did not the Lord in this sense '*come*' to him? does He not come to every faithful believer at the hour of his departure, be his death of what kind it may? Resolve this into common language, and it is in fact, 'If I will that he live till he die, what is that to thee?' Some of our Lord's sayings may appear slight, which yet prove most deep; none seem deep, and yet on nearer inspection prove utterly slight and trivial, as this so interpreted would do. We shall best interpret it by the help, and in the light, of Matt. xvi. 28; x. 23. The beloved disciple should '*tarry*.' He only among the Twelve, according to that other and earlier announcement of his Lord, should not taste of death, till he had seen 'the Son of man coming in his kingdom.' That tremendous shaking, not of the earth only, but also of the heaven, that passing away of the old Jewish economy with a great noise, to make room for a new heaven and a new earth (Heb. xii. 26, 27), he should overlive, and see the Son of man, invisibly, yet most truly, coming to execute judgment on his foes (Matt. xxiv. 34). He only of the Twelve should survive the destruction of Jerusalem, that catastrophe, the mightiest, the most significant, the most dreadful, and at the same time, as making room for the Church of the living God, the most blessed, which the world has seen; and '*tarry*' far on into the glorious age which should succeed.

Nor was this all. His whole life and ministry should be in harmony with that its peaceful end. His should be a still work throughout; to deepen the inner life of the Church rather than to extend outwardly its borders. The rougher paths were not appointed for his treading; he should be perfected by another discipline. Martyr in will, but not in deed, he should crown a calm and honoured old age by a natural and peaceful death. This, which Augustine and others make the primary meaning of the words,

we may accept as a secondary and subordinate. It was not, indeed, that he, or any other saint, should escape his share of tribulation, or that the way for him, or for any, should be other than a strait and a narrow one (Rev. i. 9). Yet we see daily how the sufferings of different members of the kingdom are allotted in very different measures; for some, they are comparatively few and far between, while for others, their whole life seems a constant falling from one trial to another.[1]

He who records these words about himself notes, but notes only to refute, an expectation which had gotten abroad among the brethren, drawn from this saying inaccurately reported or wrongly understood, namely that he should never die; for, of course, if he had indeed 'tarried' to the end of all, then mortality would in him have been swallowed up in life, and he would have passed into the heavenly kingdom without tasting death (1 Cor. xv. 51; 1 Thess. iv. 17). And is there not something more than humility in the anxious earnestness with which he repels any such interpretation? No such mournful prerogative should be his; not so long should he be absent from his Lord. There lies no such sentence upon him of weary and prolonged exclusion from that presence in which is fulness of joy (Phil. i. 23). The Synagogue may have its Wandering Jew to whom death is denied; this, however, not because there rests on him a peculiar blessing, but a peculiar curse. Yet this explicit declaration from the lips of the beloved Apostle himself, that Jesus had never said of him that he should not die, failed effectually to extinguish such a belief or superstition in the Church. We find traces of it surviving long; even his death and

[1] Bernard (*In Nativ. SS. Innocent.* 1): Et bibit ergo Johannes calicem salutaris, et secutus est Dominum, sicut Petrus, etsi non omni modo sicut Petrus. Quod enim sic mansit ut non etiam passione corporeâ Dominum sequeretur, divini fuit consilii; sicut ipse ait, Sic eum volo manere, donec veniam. Ac si dicat: Vult quidem et ipse sequi, sed ego sic eum volo manere.

burial, which men were compelled to acknowledge, were not sufficient to abolish it. For his death, some said, was only the appearance of death, and he yet breathed in his grave; so that even an Augustine was unable wholly to resist the reports which had reached him, that the earth yet heaved, and the dust was lightly stirred by the regular pulses of his breath.[1] The fable of his still living, Augustine at once rejects; but is more patient with this report than one might have expected, counting it possible that a permanent miracle might be wrought at the Apostle's grave.[2]

[1] *In Ev. Joh. tract.* cxxiv.: Cum mortuus putaretur, sepultum fuisse dormientem, et donec Christus veniat sic manere, suamque vitam scaturigine pulveris indicare: qui pulvis creditur, ut ab imo ad superficiem tumuli ascendat, flatu quiescentis impelli. Huic opinioni supervacaneum existimo reluctari. Viderint enim qui locum sciunt, utrum hoc ibi faciat vel patiatur terra, quod dicitur; quia et revera non a levibus hominibus id audivimus.

[2] See Tertullian, *De Animâ*, 50; Hilary, *De Trin.* vi. 39; Ambrose, *Exp. in Ps.* cxviii. *Serm.* xviii. 12; Jerome, *Adv. Jovin.* i. 26; Abelard, *Serm.* 24; Neander, *Kirch. Gesch.* vol. v. p. 1117. The erroneous reading *Sic* [for *Si*] eum volo manere, which early found its way into the Latin copies, and which the Vulgate, with the obstinate persistence of the Romish Church in a once-admitted error, still retains, may have helped on, and served to maintain, the mistake concerning the meaning of the words of our Lord.

LONDON: PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

WORKS

BY

R. CHENEVIX TRENCH, D.D.

ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.

NOTES on the PARABLES of OUR LORD. Fourteenth Edition. 8vo. 12*s.*

NOTES on the MIRACLES of OUR LORD. Eleventh Edition. 8vo. 12*s.*

SYNONYMS of the NEW TESTAMENT. Ninth Edition, enlarged. 8vo. 12*s.*

On the STUDY of WORDS. Eighteenth Edition, revised. Fcp. 8vo. 5*s.*

ENGLISH PAST and PRESENT. Eleventh Edition, revised and improved. Fcp. 8vo. 5*s.*

SELECT GLOSSARY of ENGLISH WORDS used formerly in senses different from the present. Fifth Edition, revised and enlarged. Fcp. 8vo. 5*s.*

PROVERBS and their LESSONS. Seventh Edition, enlarged. Fcp. 8vo. 4*s.*

On the AUTHORISED VERSION of the NEW TESTAMENT. Second Edition. 8vo. 7*s.*

LECTURES on MEDIÆVAL CHURCH HISTORY. Being the Substance of Lectures delivered at Queen's College, London. Second Edition. 8vo. 12*s.*

SERMONS PREACHED FOR THE MOST PART IN IRELAND. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS in GERMANY, and other LECTURES on the THIRTY YEARS' WAR. Second Edition, enlarged. Fcp. 8vo. 4*s.*

MACMILLAN & CO., London.

Works by R. Chenevix Trench, D.D.—(continued.)

POEMS. Collected and arranged anew. Eighth Edition. Fcp. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

COMMENTARY on the EPISTLES to the SEVEN CHURCHES in ASIA. Fourth Edition, revised. 8vo. 8*s.* 6*d.*

SACRED LATIN POETRY. Chiefly Lyrical, selected and arranged for Use. Third Edition, corrected and improved. Fcp. 8vo. 7*s.*

STUDIES in the GOSPELS. Fourth Edition, revised. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

The SERMON on the MOUNT. An Exposition drawn from the Writings of St. Augustine, with an Essay on his merits as an Interpreter of Holy Scripture. Fourth Edition, enlarged. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

The HULSEAN LECTURES for 1845–1846. Fifth Edition, revised. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

SHIPWRECKS of FAITH. Three Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge in May 1867. Fcp. 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

An ESSAY on the LIFE and GENIUS of CALDERON. With Translations from his 'Life's a Dream' and 'Great Theatre of the World.' Second Edition, revised and improved. Extra fcp. 8vo. 5*s.* 6*d.*

PLUTARCH: His Life, his Lives, and his Morals. Second Edition, enlarged. Fcp. 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

A HOUSEHOLD BOOK of ENGLISH POETRY. Selected and Arranged, with Notes, by the Archbishop of Dublin. Fourth Edition, revised. Extra fcp. 8vo. 5*s.* 6*d.*

REMAINS of the late MRS. RICHARD TRENCH. Being Selections from her Journals, Letters, and other Papers. New and Cheaper Issue. With Portrait. 8vo. 6*s.*

MACMILLAN & CO., London.

FAMILY OF FAITH COLLEGE LIBRARY
the Miracles of Our Lord.
BT 365.T7
3480400007181